



HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

007582

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

OFFICE OF
THE EXECUTIVE SECRETARY OF THE SOCIETY
NO. 346 CONVENT AVENUE, NEW YORK

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

THOMAS F. MEEHAN, PERCY J. KING
HENRY RIDDER

Editing Committee

WITHDRAWN
FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
LIBRARY

FAIRFIELD UNIVERSITY
FAIRFIELD, CONN.

VOLUME XVIII

MARCH, 1928

NEW YORK
THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY
1928

Copyright, 1928

by

THE UNITED STATES CATHOLIC
HISTORICAL SOCIETY

CONTENTS

	PAGE
Trusteeism	7
I —Trusteeism in Philadelphia	14
II—Trusteeism in New York (1815-1821)	44
<i>By the Rev. Peter Guilday, Ph.D.</i>	
Schoolboy Letters Between John LaFarge and His Father.	74
<i>Contributed by O. H. P. LaFarge</i>	
Some Records of the LaFarge Family	113
<i>By Thomas F. Meehan</i>	
Tales of Old New York	121
<i>By Thomas F. Meehan</i>	
The General Meeting	170
John England, Catholic Champion	
The Proposed Maryland Pilgrim Memorial	
<i>Editor</i>	
The Oldest American Book	202
<i>Editor</i>	
List of Members	205



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025

CATHOLIC HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES

TRUSTEEISM

BY REV. PETER GUILDAY, PH.D.

It is now twelve years since Father Gerald C. Treacy, S. J., gave us, in *HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES*, an excellent historical summary of the rise and spread of the trustee evil in the United States. During that time many interesting documents on this perplexing question have been brought to light. We are better able today to appreciate the truth of Father Treacy's conclusion: "It would be wrong to imagine that trustee troubles were confined to any particular section of the country or that only a single bishop was called upon to solve the problems they presented. The fact is that they were limited by the boundaries of no diocese; their blighting influence was felt in all."

Some cities, however suffered particularly from the schismatic tendencies visible in many of our earliest congregations, and chief amongst these were Philadelphia and New York. More than once during the century that has passed since the troublous times in these two cities, the Church in the United States has been perturbed by movements of a similar nature on the part of the different nationalities in this country. In most cases the opposition to recognized ecclesiastical authority has been of a mixed nature, involving racial feelings and the question of the tenure of Church property. The formal condemnation of Hogan by the Holy See on August 22, 1822, prescribed the norm for all future juridic action. Trusteeism, as a mode of securing Church property from alienation, was not condemned by the Holy See; but the immoderate claims of the trustees in temporal affairs and their invasion of the spiritual jurisdiction of the bishops were reprobated as alien to Church discipline. The story of trusteeism should one day be told in its entirety, for it contains a potent lesson among

a people like ours made up of so many different nationalities. Nothing has so crippled our spiritual progress as the perdurance of national preferences and viewpoints. Many students of American Catholic history consider the trustee evil as something belonging entirely to the past or as a disease which has been cured by such courageous leaders as Maréchal, England, Kenrick and Hughes. The truth is that some of the evils which invariably accompany the nationalistic spirit as displayed through lay interference in Church matters linger still in American Catholic life.

Originally prepared for the "Life and Times of John England," the following pages were written in an attempt to present the trustee quarrels of these two cities in the light of fresh documentary evidence.

A remarkable review of Catholic progress in America, written by Father Harold for the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, about the year 1820, contains the clearest exposition we possess for the basic cause of the quarrels that were dividing the faithful in so many important cities in the United States. He touched the problem of trusteeism with a sure hand. The trustee system was an evil; all with whom he had conversed in America admitted its baleful influence upon the progress of the Church here. But he qualifies this sweeping condemnation with the phrase: "I have called the trustee system an evil, but it was perhaps an unavoidable one." This admission is corroborated by another American priest, who was then in Italy, and whose experience was even broader than that of Father Harold, Father John Anthony Grassi, S. J., who had labored in the missions here from 1810 to 1817. During part of this time, he was President of Georgetown College and Superior of the Society of Jesus in the United States. After his return to Europe (1817) he spent some time in Milan and Turin, and later became Rector of the College of Propaganda. It was but natural that Propaganda should consult him on the intricate question of American trusteeism, and in the "Atti" for 1819, we find the transcript of a letter he wrote on the problem:

By virtue of the laws in America, Churches cannot *possess*, unless they are *incorporated* by the Legislature of the State in which they are, and by means of this act of incorporation all the material value of the church, the pres-

bytery, the cemetery, or other goods belonging to the church are placed under the guardianship of the law, in order that they may be used for their destined purposes. For that reason, an act of incorporation is never in harmony with the authority of law unless there be syndics or administrators for the same church property. These are called *Trustees* or *Vestrymen*, and they are elected from time to time from the Catholic congregation belonging to the church. The same thing exists also among the Protestants. The advantage which arises from this *Incorporation* is, that the property does not run the danger of being lost to the purposes for which it is intended. In many cases, however, instead of incorporation, the property is held in the name of a particular person, as, for example, the bishop, or the missionary, etc., and these in the eyes of the law are private owners of the property. In this case, it is clear that if ever the possessor die *intestate*, the heirs could by virtue of the laws claim the property. Or, if the possessor himself should so wish, he might alienate the property and he could have protection of the law in his favour. I have heard that such a case did arise in Philadelphia, where there were some houses belonging to the Church, but held in the name of a priest. At his death, his nephew claimed the houses, and this was the principal reason why Archbishop Carroll of illustrious memory was not so adverse to the trustee system.

The evil arose when unworthy men were placed in the trusteeship of the church or when the pastor lacked that prudence which the local circumstances required for an harmonious cooperation. "The essential point to be well understood is this, that once the church is *legally incorporated*, there is no further legal remedy against any evil which may occur."

Unfortunately, such explanations as these by Fathers Harold and Grassi reached the Sacred Congregation long after the evils inherent in American trusteeism had taken hold of so many congregations: New York, Philadelphia, Charleston, Norfolk, Savannah, St. Augustine, New Orleans and St. Louis. From his personal experience Father Harold, in speaking of the Church in New York, says that "everything depends on the prudence and talents of the Priests," and he points out how Father O'Brien, pastor of St. Peter's in that city, had lived for thirty years "in peace with the trustees." There was only one sure remedy—suppression. Harold says:

But as this office of Trustee is liable to degenerate into abuse, and will often be abused, notwithstanding the utmost caution and most exemplary conduct of the Pastor, measures should be adopted for its gradual suppression. Such an attempt will require great discretion and considerable influence, but the best Catholics wish for it, and would gladly concur in any prudent plan which might be devised for the purpose. Religious establishments and collegiate churches appear to me to be the most practicable and effectual means of superseding these trustees. The Legislature would as readily incorporate a number of Priests as of Laymen. The State Legislature have already incorporated Religious bodies in America, who conduct the affairs of their churches without any interference on the part of laymen. The people are most anxious to have Priests amongst them, and they would willingly give money for the erection of churches. The Bishops availing themselves of this disposition, might make it a condition, in granting leave for the building of all churches in future, that there should be no Board of Trustees, but that the title to all church property should be vested in himself and a certain number of his clergy, who might easily obtain an act of the legislature to incorporate them for that purpose. The Catholics, rather than be deprived of a Priest and a church, would soon give up any attachment they may have to the Trustee System. Means might be easily devised to correct all the abuses which exist in the church of America, and my knowledge of that people enables me to assure your Eme. that their minds could, with little difficulty, be prepared to submit to prudent regulations on these matters. These people yield a willing obedience to authority when exercised coolly and with mildness, but if their feelings and opinions are treated with violent and contemptuous disregard, they become obstinate and incorrigible.

Their jealousy of Foreign interference is extreme. They would consider their independence endangered if the lowest officer under their Government could obtain his place thro' such interference. It is a subject of common conversation in Rome, that the French Bishop of Quebec and other personages of that Nation had recommended to the Sacred Congregation a certain Clergyman for the coadjutorship of New York—I know that the Apostolic Delegate in Lisbon was induced, by a Minister of the Portuguese Government, to recommend another Priest for the See of Philadelphia. I also know that in neither case did the Sacred Congregation attend to these recommendations. But allow me to submit to your Eme., how would the Government of England or of

Portugal feel, if they detected a Minister or a subject of the United States exerting his influence to have a Bishop appointed in Canada or in the Brasils? If these things were known to the American Government they would look on every priest and Bishop in the United States, as so many foreign spies, and the Catholics to remove all doubt of their loyalty from the minds of their fellow-Citizens, might feel themselves obliged to apply to Congress for some legislative act, which the present discipline of the church could not tolerate, and which might separate that portion of the church from the centre of Unity. Some fanatical member of Congress, having it in his power to bring such a suspicion on the Catholic Religion, might raise a tumult which would, in its consequences, affect the conditions of the Catholic church in America for ages. The Sacred Congregation in legislating for that church, should never forget, that the Sovereign Power in these States, is the will of the people; and that their representatives in Congress yield to their instructions an obedience more ready and more implicit, than is given by the subjects of an absolute Monarch to his decrees. In such a state of things, it will, I trust, appear evident to your Eme. that the wishes of this people, when they do not pass the bounds of duty, nor encroach on the sacred limits of church discipline, should be treated with great mildness and indulgence. This would encrease their attachment to the Holy See, without which no people ever adhered with constancy to the Catholic faith. Jealousy of the Holy See led to that disastrous Schism under which the Greek Church has perished, and I believe the same cause contributed not a little, to banish for a time, the very name of Christianity from the illustrious church of France, which is now but slowly rising from the ruins of her former greatness.

The trustee system was gradually abolished in the United States. Bishop England's Constitution was the first effective barrier to its continuance in the Carolinas and Georgia. In that part of the Archdiocese of Baltimore under Maréchal's jurisdiction, peace was kept to a certain extent until the year 1829, when the first national law was passed to curb the evils of the system. In Philadelphia, with the passing of Dr. Conwell's authority, better days and saner policies came to the leaders of that city. Here and there throughout the land, trusteeism showed its ugly spirit, while in the Diocese of New York it may be said not to have been fully conquered until the episcopate of John Hughes.

Archbishop Hughes had the advantage of a long and bitter experience with the trustee system, and yet he could write in 1855, that "regarded *a priori*, no system could appear to be less objectionable, or more likely both to secure advantages to those congregations, and at the same time to recommend the Catholic religion to the liberal consideration of the Protestant sentiment of the country. It would, he thought, relieve the priest from the necessity and painfulness of having to appeal from the altar on questions connected with money, touching either the means of his own support, repairs of the church, or other measures essential to the welfare of his congregation. It would at the same time secure the property, by the protection of law, for the perpetual uses to which it had been set apart and consecrated. It would be a bond of union between the priest and the people. It would be a shield to protect the minister of the altar from the very suspicion of being a money seeker, and at the same time a means to provide for his decent maintenance. All these were no doubt the considerations which moved the venerable and patriotic Archbishop (Carroll) to adopt and recommend the system of Lay trustees. On paper and in theory that system was entirely inobjectionable.

"It was well calculated to gain the confidence of a mind so generous and so liberal as that of the first Archbishop of Baltimore. But in practice it became the bitter chalice of his old age. It led to violent strifes in Charleston and in Norfolk. It led to riots and bloodshed in Baltimore and Philadelphia. Archbishop Carroll, when there were but two churches in Baltimore, was doomed to witness the congregation of one of them assembling at the house of divine worship on Sunday with loaded muskets in their hands. He was doomed even during his own administration to see an excommunicated priest inaugurated by lay trustees in another church in Philadelphia; and to undergo a legal prosecution at the hands of lay trustees, in the civil court, for a simple act of episcopal jurisdiction. It is impossible to tell what would have been the consequence of that prosecution had it not been for the high character the good prelate had sustained, and for the high estimation in which he was held by the whole community of Philadelphia, Protestant as well as Catholic. After his death, similar results of lay-trusteeship followed in the church of St. Mary in Philadelphia. Whoever will turn to the press of that

city in the years 1821, 1822, 1823, 1824, and 1825, will see melancholy evidence of its workings in social strifes, religious enmities, schism, lawsuits, fearful riots, and bloodshed. The evils which manifested themselves in these churches on a grand scale, were witnessed in a minor degree in almost every congregation throughout the country, under the government of lay trustees. The churches of this city were by no means exempt from them; and some of our older Catholic inhabitants have witnessed, both in St. Peter's and in St. Patrick's, scenes of strife which they deplored, and which they would be ashamed to read in recorded detail."*

*Kehoe, "Works," Vol. I, p. 150.

I

TRUSTEEISM IN PHILADELPHIA

(1814-1821)

When Bishop Michael Egan died in Philadelphia, on July 22, 1814, there were ten priests laboring in the missions of the Diocese of Philadelphia. Father McGirr was at the pro-Cathedral of St. Mary's; the two well-known Augustinians, Fathers Matthew Carr and Michael Hurley, were in charge of St. Augustine's; Father Roloff was pastor at Holy Trinity; Father Michael Byrne and Prince Gallitzin were ministering to the Catholics in the centre of the State; Father William F. X. O'Brien was stationed at Pittsburgh; Father Louis De Barth, at Conewago; Father Paul Ernsten, at Goshenhoppen; and Father Patrick Kenny, at Wilmington, Delaware.¹ The two Dominicans, Fathers William Vincent Harold and John Ryan (the first had been Vicar-General), had returned to Ireland before the death of Dr. Egan. Sometime before he passed away, Bishop Egan appointed Father Louis De Barth, Vicar-General of the Diocese, and after the Bishop's death, Archbishop Carroll informed the trustees of St. Mary's that Father De Barth would administer the Diocese of Philadelphia until the appointment of a bishop.

The selection of a successor to the See of Philadelphia was not an easy one. The available candidates were few and delay was caused by the *impasse* which had arisen between Propaganda and the American hierarchy on the subject of episcopal nominations. Archbishop Carroll had admired the younger Harold and had written to him (February 20, 1813) that his determination to leave Philadelphia was one "of the greatest misfortunes that can befall that diocese and the American church generally."² Car-

¹Shea, "History of the Catholic Church in the United States," vol. III, p. 216.

²In his letter to Harold on the occasion of their departure (February 20, 1813), Archbishop Carroll said: "My greatest apprehension is your disgust, and consequent determination of leaving Philadelphia; which indeed your letter indicates, as a matter concluded, and which, in my estimation, is one

roll appealed to Harold in the same letter to suspend further action until he could see Bishop Egan, but upon their decision to leave America, wrote a warm letter of recommendation for Fathers Harold and Ryan, on the eve of their departure for Ireland, to their fellow-Dominican, Archbishop Troy, of Dublin. Ryan's attack, however, on the Clergy Corporation of Maryland, alleging that the keeping of slaves on the clergy estates was a scandal and obstacle to the progress of Faith in America, in a conversation which occurred in London but which found its way to Baltimore, caused Dr. Carroll considerable pain. The venerable Baltimore prelate wrote a strong letter to Bishop Moylan, of Cork, against both Dominicans and accused them of misrepresenting the condition of the slaves on the old Jesuit plantations. Fathers Harold and Ryan replied, disclaiming any intention of criticizing the Archbishop, but repeating their objections to the presence of slaves on the clergy estates.³ Copies of this correspondence were sent to Cardinal Litta.

Shortly after Bishop Egan's death, Archbishop Carroll wrote to his suffragans (Neale, Cheverus and Flaget) and to the administrators of New York and Philadelphia (Kohlmann and De Barth) asking them to propose the names of several priests worthy of episcopal election to the vacant See of Philadelphia. The names first canvassed were those of Father David, then in Bardstown, Fathers Du Bourg, Gallitzin, De Barth, and Benedict Fenwick, S. J. After mature deliberations, Father David and Father Du Bourg, who was then the administrator of the Diocese of Louisiana, were agreed upon; and their names were sent to Propaganda. In one sense this action of the American prelates had no official sanction, since the Holy See had not given its consent to the plan of nomination to vacant Sees, as proposed in the meeting of the hierarchy at Baltimore in 1810. It is a question whether this letter, containing the two names, ever reached the

of the greatest misfortunes that can befall that Diocese, and the American Church generally. The Bishop as I have been informed is to leave Philadelphia next week for Baltimore. For Heaven's sake, suspend any further proceedings or engagements, until I can see him." Propaganda Archives, "Scrittura riferite, America Centrale," vol. 4, ff. 348—the whole letter is printed in Guilday, "Carroll," pp. 681-685).

³The letter to Bishop Moylan, together with a long memorandum to Archbishop Murray, is in the Dominican Archives at Tallaght.

Roman officials. There is nothing in the Propaganda Archives of 1814-1815 to show that the Sacred Congregation received Carroll's list of nominations of November, 1814. In fact, he says in a letter to Father Plowden (June 25, 1815): "The original of November 1814, and *triplicate copies* of them were forwarded, and two of them by safe persons, under cover to the Nuncio in Paris. Yet none were received at Rome, March 11. They contained the names of two persons recommended by all the Bishops here, one of whom shall fill the vacant See."⁴

The friends of Father Harold in Philadelphia were genuinely anxious that he should succeed Bishop Egan. Their activities in Harold's behalf began even before Egan's death; and later, when Harold returned to Philadelphia (1821), the statement was made that the difficulty of 1812-13 between the bishop and the trustees was the desire of the latter gentlemen to have Harold appointed coadjutor to Dr. Egan. Another source of support for Harold was his uncle, Father James Harold, a secular priest, who had been with his nephew in the pastorate of St. Mary's. On October 7, 1814, Father James Harold wrote to Pius VII from Bordeaux strongly recommending his nephew for the vacant See. He speaks of his nephew as *pium, doctum, eloquentem, praedicatorum primae classis*. He knew no one more worthy or more capable for the See of Philadelphia, and he assures the Pope that William's promotion would bring joy to the thousands of Irish Catholics in the United States.⁵ In the *Atti* of February 6, 1815, Propaganda deliberated on the Philadelphia situation, as exposed in James Harold's letter, and deplored the lack of information on the state of the Church in that diocese. For almost a year, no letter had been received from Carroll, and they suspended judgment until he had been consulted on the succession to Philadelphia (*Ma sono circa dieci mesi che non è ricevuta più lettera del medesimo, ondè che nulla si sa dello stato della cattolica religione*).⁶ On February 24, 1815, Carroll wrote to Propaganda, stating that he had despatched letters to Rome (in triplicate) on November 8, 1814, and on January 7, 1815, regarding the vacant Sees of Louisiana, Phila-

⁴"Stonyhurst Transcripts." Cf. Guilday, "Carroll," pp. 672-673 for entire letter.

⁵Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, fol. 308.

⁶Prop. Arch., "Atti" (1815), fol. 625.

delphia, and New York. Du Bourg's journey to Rome gave him the opportunity of sending word directly to Rome on the condition of affairs here. Carroll himself had not heard from Rome (*multis annis nullas omnino litteras*). He does not mention the nominees for New York or Philadelphia, but states that Du Bourg is willing to accept the burden of the Louisiana bishopric (*forti animo paratum esse ad subcundas molestias in Louisiana*).⁷

Harold found another friend in Archbishop Troy. Troy's agent in Rome had given to Propaganda the Dublin prelate's letter recommending Harold. The Sacred Congregation replied to Troy (March 11, 1815) acknowledging the letter and mentioning that James Harold had also given information on Harold's ability to govern the vacant See. Propaganda hesitated because it had learned of the difference of opinion between Harold and Carroll over some slaves on the clergy estates (*per ragione dei schiavi che sono impiegati al servizio dei Padri Gesuiti*); and so, Troy is asked to ascertain whether the promotion of the young Dominican would be displeasing to Baltimore.⁸ That same day, Propaganda wrote to Carroll, regretting the delay in filling the vacant See, explaining that nothing could be decided owing to the scanty information it possessed (*plane inscia est de statu catholice religionis . . . in foederatis istis Americae provinciis etc.*).

Dr. Connolly's appointment to New York, the Sacred Congregation hoped, would be the beginning of better things in that diocese. Of Philadelphia, all that could be said at present was that it had been reported to Propaganda that no one was better fitted for the See of Philadelphia than Father William Harold, *concionator praestantissimus*, who was vicar-general to the late bishop. But nothing could be done until they had heard from Carroll himself. Probably Propaganda's first intimation of the nominations made by the American prelates themselves came in Bishop Flaget's letter of April 11, 1815, in which he protests against the removal of David from Bardstown. Flaget had placed all his hopes for the future of religion in the seminary he had begun, and Father David was the best man he had to rule the institution. To take

⁷Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, ff. 316-317.

⁸Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 296, fol. 45v.

either David or Nerinckx away from him—"ce seroit m'arracher les deux yeux!"⁹

Archbishop Carroll had definitely decided against Harold for Philadelphia. "As to my personal feelings on this subject," he wrote to Plowden, on June 25, 1815, "I am almost indifferent, but for the sake of the clergy and congrs. of Pennsa., and especially Philada., I deprecate his appointment which would be a signal for rancour, religious and political; religious, between the friends of the holy deceased Bishop and partisans of Harold; political, between the opponents of previous democracy and innovators upon established governments, or rather those who are always ripe for innovation, glossed over with the fair pretexts of the rights of the people."¹⁰ It is in this letter to his English correspondent that Carroll accuses Troy and other prelates of Ireland and the Archbishop of Bordeaux of serious interference in the independent action of the American bishops.

When Carroll's list of candidates finally reached Rome, Propaganda wrote (July 1, 1815), commenting on the fact that Harold was not among the priests mentioned for the vacant See. Cardinal Litta asked, therefore, for the reason for this omission. A few weeks later, on learning that Dr. Connolly had been sent to New York, Carroll expressed his surprise to Litta (July 17, 1815), that, *non expectata episcoporum sententia qui in hac provincia ecclesiastica sunt*, Propaganda had consecrated the new Bishop of New York. To fill the vacant See of Philadelphia, two priests had been suggested, David and Du Bourg. Carroll had heard of the efforts to promote Harold to that See, and understood that the Dominican had been warmly recommended by Archbishop Troy and other Irish Bishops. This news caused considerable feeling among the American prelates, who resented such an intrusion in what was strictly an American Church matter. Harold, Carroll says in his letter, is a priest of great eloquence, of correct life and worthy in every way; but in his conflict with Bishop Egan, he created so much dissension that his return, *cum nova dignitate*, would only increase the evil in Philadelphia.¹¹

⁹Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, ff. 327-328; cf. Webb, "The Centenary of Catholicity in Kentucky," chapter XVI ("Rev. John B. David—The Seminary of St. Thomas,") pp. 226-232. Louisville, 1884.

¹⁰"Stonyhurst Archives;" printed in full in Guilday, "Carroll" pp. 672-673.

¹¹Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 296, fol. 123.

Dr. Carroll evidently believed the news of Harold's appointment to be correct, and he wrote the following day (July 18) to Bishop Neale, calling upon him, Father Grassi, and Father Francis Neale "to guard the legal property of Mr. F. Neale [St. Mary's] from invasion and foreign appropriation. It being uncertain how soon Mr. H. may arrive, no time should be lost in giving directions to Mr. Debarth to repair to Philada., maintain the mastership of the house, the old chapel and premises. He is a firm man and will execute orders."¹² On August 12, 1815, Father Neale sent a power of attorney to Father De Barth for the administration of the Philadelphia and Pennsylvania Church property.¹³ This letter Carroll forgot to send, and on August 16, he wrote a postscript apologizing for the delay; an old man of eighty without a secretary, he says, can not keep track of everything.¹⁴

A particular Congregation of the Cardinals of Propaganda was held on September 14, 1815, to discuss American affairs. Du Bourg was elected Bishop of New Orleans and to him was given the duty of bringing peace into that portion of the American vineyard, so badly disturbed, Propaganda says, by the Capuchin Father Antonio de Sedella. The *Atti* for this meeting contains a well-written and well-documented history of the Church in the United States from 1784 to 1815. To the *dubium*: who should be elected to the See of Philadelphia, the answer was: Ambrose Maréchal.¹⁵

When Father Nerinckx was about to leave for Rome in October, 1815, Archbishop Carroll wrote again to Cardinal Litta (October 10, 1815) protesting against the appointment of Harold.¹⁶ Carroll had written in the meantime to Troy, informing him that he would brook no "irregular interposition or recommendation" from foreign ecclesiastics in the management of his archdiocese; and on October 13, he wrote confidently to Plowden: "I do not and probably shall not hear of Harold's appointment." In a further discussion (December 11, 1815) on the Philadelphia situation, the Cardinals of Propaganda reviewed the

¹²Cited by Hughes, "History of the Society of Jesus," etc., Documents, vol. II, pt. II, p. 861.

¹³*Ibid.*, p. 862.

¹⁴Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 296, fol. 338.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, "Atti" (1815), fol. 288.

¹⁶*Ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, fol. 350.

proposed candidates. Harold was excluded because of Carroll's attitude, and the decision was reached that Ambrose Maréchal should be sent to Philadelphia (*Sogetto dignissimo e fornito di tutte le qualità che possono mai desiderarsi in un vescovo*).¹⁷ In

¹⁷As an example of the thorough method followed by the officials of Propaganda in these congregations, the following excerpt from the "Atti" of 1815 (fol. 284v.) is interesting:

"Vescovato di Filadelfia nelle Provincie Unite di America. 15. Fin dai 22 Luglio 1814 consunto dalle fatiche passo agli eterni riposi Monsignor Michele Egan, Vescovo di Filadelfia nelle Provincie Unite di America. Il primo a darne parte fu il prete Irlandese Giacomo Harold, il quale da Filadelfia tornava in Irlanda, e pregava la S. Congregazione a far promuovere a quella chiesa il sacerdote Guglielmo Vincenzo Harold, suo nipote, già Vicario Generale dell' istesso Monsignor Egan, ed esimio predicatore. Anche Monsignor Arcivescovo di Dublin raccomandando un tal soggetto, ma essendosene scritto per informazione a Monsignor Carroll, Arcivescovo di Baltimora, egli con lettera dei 20 Luglio 1815 risponde anche per parte degli altri vescovi di quelle Provincie che D. Guglielmo Harold è bensì di buoni costumi, eccelente nella predicazione, ma audace ed arrogante a segno che caricò d'ingiurie il suo vescovo Egan, e gli fece per mezzo de'suoi amici un aspra guerra, ond'è che il prelado lo rimosse dall'impiego di vicario generale, e stabili di non commettergli più nulla nella sua diocesi alcuna cura. Stima perciò l'arcivescovo che l'elezione di Harold aprirebbe il campo a molte e gravi dissensioni

16. Aveva Monsignor Carroll precedentemente scritto in data dei Novembre 28, 1814 e 7 Gennaio 1815, suggerendo alla S. Congregazione anche per parte degli altri vescovi i soggetti più degni per essere promossi alla chiesa di Filadelfia. Tre sono i soggetti proposti. In primo luogo il sacerdote Francese Giovanni David della Congregazione di S. Sulpizio di anni circa 50, e questo viene raccomandato da Mgr. Carroll, e suo coadiutore, dal vescovo di Boston, dall'amministratore della Nuova York, e dall'amministratore di Filadelfia con varj di quel clero. In secondo luogo D. Guglielmo Du Bourg di S. Domingo amministratore della Luigiana. Questo peraltro non ha più luogo, essendo stato ordinato per la Nuova Orleans. Finalmente il sacerdote Demetrio Agostino della famiglia del principe Gallitzin di circa 42 anni, ordinato in Baltimora. Questo viene assai commendato da Mgr. Carroll e dal suo coadiutore, come sacerdote dotto e pio, ma non lo giudicano molto a proposto per l'episcopato, perchè manca di prudenza nel contrarre facilmente dei debiti, di cui è molto gravato.

17. Dice Monsignor Carroll che fino dal Novembre del 1810 scrissero tutti i vescovi di quelle provincie alla S. Congregazione, proponendo i soggetti abili a poter rimpiazzare le sedi vacanti, ma questa lettera non giunse. Era da principio intenzione dei vescovi di raccomandare alla S. Sede il Sig. D. Ambrogio Marechal sacerdote di Orleans, e socio anch'egli della Congregazione di S. Sulpizio, attulmente rettore del Seminario di Baltimora, di circa anni 42, soggetto degnissimo e fornito di tutte le qualità che possono mai desiderarsi in un vescovo. Difatti Monsignor Concanen fatta vescovo della Nuova York si era proposto di chiederlo per suo coadiutore. Riflette peraltro Mons. Carroll che il farlo vescovo porterebbe la sovversione del seminario di Baltimora nel quale è riposta tutta la speranza di quelle diocesi.

18. Monsignor Du Bourg porta parere, che niun meglio si possa eleggere alla chiesa di Filadelfia quanto il Sig. D. Ambrogio Marechal già professore di teologia nei seminari di Aix e

fact, Bishop Concanen had already spoken of him in 1810 as his choice for the coadjutorship of New York. On December 23, 1815, (Carroll died December 3), Propaganda announced the nomination of Maréchal.¹⁸

Shortly after Carroll's death, Archbishop Neale, unaware of Maréchal's election to Philadelphia, wrote to Propaganda (February 4, 1816) presenting his name together with that of Cheverus as candidates for the coadjutorship of Baltimore.¹⁹ On February 5, 1816, Du Bourg, then on his way back to Louisiana, wrote to Neale from Florence of Maréchal's appointment to the See of Philadelphia.²⁰ On reaching Bologna, Du Bourg wrote to the Cardinal-Prefect urging Propaganda to have Maréchal's briefs ready before he sailed. The death of Carroll, he writes, is a great calamity to the Church in America. His successor, Archbishop Neale, is unable to carry on the work of the archdiocese, being too old and infirm; and it would be an excellent thing for Propaganda to suggest to him the selection of a coadjutor at once.²¹ Maréchal's briefs were despatched to Du Bourg at Bordeaux on February 17, 1816, and copies of the originals were also despatched through the Filicchi Brothers at Leghorn.²² When the Superior-General of the Sulpicians, at Paris, heard the news of Maréchal's appointment, he wrote at once to the Cardinal-Prefect (June 28, 1816):

"I have just learned that His Holiness, Pius VII, has recently named for the Bishopric of Philadelphia M. Maréchal, one of the Directors of the Seminary of St. Sulpice which M. Emery established, with your consent, at Baltimore, at the time of our Revolution. This is the third nomination which the Sovereign Pontiff has made among members of this Seminary in order to

Lion, ora rettore di quello di Baltimore, uomo egualmente dotto che santo, il quale da Mons. Carroll era stato già designato vescovo della Nuova York, e richiesto poi da Monsig. Concanen per suo successore. Non ignora Mons. Du Bourg che alla cattedra di Filadelfia è stato proposto il Sig. D. Giovanni David, sacerdote anch'egli di grandissimo merito, ma dice che questo è assolutamente necessario a Monsig. Flaget Vescovo del Kentucky per la direzione del suo seminario."

¹⁸Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 296, fol. 245.

¹⁹*Ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, fol. 360. Neale says in his letter: "*Horum alterutrum habere in Coadjutorem pergratum mihi foret.*"

²⁰Baltimore Cathedral Archives, cited as BCA, Case 12A-B1.

²¹Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, fol. 358.

²²*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 297, ff. 44, 52.

fill the new Sees in that part of the Christian world. The first of these was M. Flaget, Bishop of Kentucky, who would only accept the post on condition that M. Emery give him for some time M. David, another excellent Director of the same Seminary. At the beginning of this year, His Holiness also named to the Bishopric of New Orleans M. Du Bourg, a member of the same Seminary and distinguished by his talents. All these nominations honour us considerably, but they tend nevertheless to ruin radically the establishment, so important for the formation of the clergy there. . . . If M. Maréchal is obliged to accept the Bishopric of Philadelphia, he will no longer remain in the Seminary as the Superior of that house instructing the young clerics. . . . M. Nagot, whom your Eminence knew, has just died; the other Directors are only young men, without experience, whom we have not been able on account of time to form sufficiently. . . . Moreover, M. Maréchal has a strong dislike to the episcopal dignity, for which he does not believe himself to be at all fitted. He begs me with insistence to do all in my power to obtain the revocation of the brief of his nomination. . . . Moreover I do not think he is the man to succeed in the government of that diocese, agitated, as I am told, by serious divisions, which require a conciliatory leader.”²³

Maréchal had written to Cardinal Litta on April 9, 1816, protesting he would not accept a mitre, as we learn from one of his letters to Archbishop Neale (November 9, 1816): “J’ai souvent pris la résolution devant Dieu de refuser l’épiscopat, si jamais il m’étoit offert, tant que je le pourrais faire *tuta conscientia*”,²⁴ and on July 13, 1816, Litta replied that the reasons Maréchal had offered for declining Philadelphia were of such nature that the Holy See, instead of abiding by his refusal, asked him to acquiesce in its plans for the vacant See and to accept the post.²⁵

In the meantime, Neale’s letter proposing Maréchal *in secundo loco* for the coadjutorship of Baltimore had reached Rome, and on August 17, 1816, the Cardinal-Prefect wrote to Neale that if Maréchal had not been consecrated for the See of Philadelphia,

²³*Ibid.*, “Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.” vol. 3, fol. 374.

²⁴BCA, Case 12B-J2.

²⁵Prop. Arch., “Lettere,” vol. 297, fol. 163. Copy in BCA, Case Special B-13.

the ceremony should be postponed, since the Sacred Congregation was inclined to appoint him to Baltimore. David should not be taken away from Bardstown, that was quite evident from Flaget's letters; hence Neale should send in other names for the vacant See of Philadelphia. If Maréchal had been consecrated when Litta's letter arrived, he was directed to remain in Baltimore until orders should reach him from Rome.²⁶ The Bulls for his consecration had indeed arrived on July 3, 1816, but Maréchal stoutly refused to accept the burden of the episcopate. This we learn from a letter written, September 10, 1816, to his intimate friend and successor, Father James Whitfield, then at Crosby, near Stonyhurst, England:

Mon cher Ami,

Le malheur que je redoutois tant m'a frappé. Le 3 juillet dernier Mr. Neale archevêque de Baltimore a reçu des Bulles par les quelles S.S. me nomme évêque de Philadelphia. Après avoir élevé mon coeur à Dieu dans une circonstance si terrible pour moi, je les ai lues avec tout le profond respect que merite la dignité supreme du Vicaire de J.C., lorsqu'il daigne adresser la parole à un pauvre Pretre tel que je suis. Heureusement elles sont conçues dans la forme ordinaire. Point de *praecepta* d'accepter, ainsi qu'on me l'avoit fait craindre. Après avoir fait de profondes reflexions, & consulté les personnes les plus éclairées & les plus saintes que je connaisse, j'ai cru devoir refuser la dignité formidable qui m'est offerte. C'est ce que j'ai signifié & à Monseigr. Neale & à Mr. De Barth qui administre maintenant avec beaucoup de sagesse & de zèle le Diocèse de Philadelphia. . . . Je ne vous ferai point ici le détail des grands motifs qui ont déterminé mon refus. Je l'ai envoyé au S. Pontife & j'espère de sa bonté & de sa miséricorde que S.S. ne me forcera pas de sortir de l'état de retraite & d'obscurité dans le quel je desire de tout mon coeur vivre & mourir. Cependant je vois avec une grande douleur que si j'échappois la dignité que je redoute, je ne serai pas encore en sureté. Il faut bien vous dire, Mon cher ami (oh! comment pourrai je avoir quelque chose de caché pour vous?) Mr. L'arch. a écrit au pape une lettre dans laquelle il prie instamment le St. Père de me faire son coadjutor. Il est vrai qu'il presenta avec moi un autre prêtre qui m'est bien supérieur sous tous les rapports & qui conviendrait mieux pour être son successeur. Mais le S. Pontife qui ne

²⁶*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 297, fol. 200.

me connaît que par des rapports extrêmement exagérés, ne placera-t-il pas le fardeau sur mes faibles épaules? La pensée seule qui me menace me fait trembler. C'est dans la situation pénible où je me trouve que j'ai reçu votre dernière. Jugez du plaisir qu'elle m'a faite. Si je passe ma vie avec la qualité de simple Prêtre, quelque plaisir que j'eusse à vous voir en Amérique, jamais je n'aurai le courage de vous inviter à passer la mer. Mais si malheureusement j'étois évêque, je compte sur vous. Quelque bien que vous me fassiez à Crosby-Hall, il y en auroit un bien plus grand à faire ici. Nous travaillerions ensemble, nous nous appliquerions à notre sanctification et à celle de mes nombreuses ouailles. A la vérité, vous aimant aussi sincèrement que [je] le fais, il me coutera de vous dire de quitter votre agréable situation pour un pays nouveau où la généralité des Européens se plaisent beaucoup, mais où peut-être vous n'auriez pas tous les agréments que vous pourriez désirer. La pureté de vos motifs & celle des miens est ce qui me rassure. Nous travaillerions d'un commun accord à étendre la gloire de Dieu & sauver des âmes rachetées du Sang de J.C. Cette grande vue adoucit les peines, soutient & console dans nos sacrifices. Dieu & Dieu seul, voilà le principe & la terme de ma vie & des travaux d'un Prêtre. . . . Tout ce que la Prudence me permet de vous dire, c'est de vous tenir prêt à venir vous réunir à moi, si l'événement que je crains, a lieu. . . . La promesse que vous avez faite de travailler dans les missions, sera parfaitement rempli. Votre évêque, ce me semble, ne peut s'opposer à votre départ. Vous n'êtes attaché à Stonyhurst que par les liens de l'amitié. Ainsi vous êtes parfaitement libre. . . . Quant à votre fortune vous pourrez la placer ici assui sûrement & avantageusement que dans aucun pays de l'Europe. L'or et les billets payables en Angleterre gagnent beaucoup ici. . . . Quant à vos effets ecclésiastiques, ils seroient propos de les prendre avec vous. . . . Le genre de livres que vous devez apporter avec vous, depend de ma situation future. Mais j'aurai soin de vous écrire de nouveau sur ce sujet & d'autres, suivant les circonstances. Mon desir pour le moment seroit de vous mettre dans la *possibilité* de passer en Amérique. Pour les choses de details, je vous les ferai connaître à tems. . . . Le brave Pelocieux, votre ancien et bon ami, ayant apparemment étendu dire que j'étois nommé évêque a obtenue, à ce que l'on dit, la permission de venir me trouver. Je ne seroit surpris de le voir dans le courant du mois prochain ou au plus tard, au printems.

Prions Dieu, Mon cher Ami, l'un pour l'autre, afin que nous fassions sa sainte volonté; que dans tous les evenements

qui nous touchent, nous ne suivions point nos faibles lumières; mais la sienne qui est toujours bonne, juste & sainte. Je ne manquerai point de vous offrir à notre Seigneur comme la compagnon de mes travaux, de mes joyes & de mes peines. Adieu, Mon cher Ami. Je vous embrasse de tout mon coeur. Tout à vous,

Balt. 10th Sept. 1816.

AMB. MARÉCHAL.²⁷

The Sacred Congregation confessed to Du Bourg on November 26, 1816, that nothing definite was foreseen at the moment in the case of Philadelphia. Their only hope was that De Barth would accept the vacant See.²⁸ Bishop Cheverus who had come to Baltimore to invest Archbishop Neale with the pallium, now took a hand in trying to disentangle the knot created by Maréchal's refusal, but he does not mention any names, merely hinting that Father Tessier, the Sulpician, would make an excellent bishop.²⁹ This praise was well deserved, for Tessier was the confidant and guide to Carroll, Neale, and Maréchal, and it was his keen knowledge of men and of ecclesiastical affairs which directed Maréchal in the whole trend of events in the Southland leading up to the Schism. Later, in Archbishop Whitfield's time, he was appointed Vicar-General. Few priests have had it in their power to render higher services to the Church in the United States than Tessier; and had he been appointed to Philadelphia, a different story and a more enheartening one might be written of this distracted period under study.

Maréchal, as Bishop-Elect of Philadelphia, replied on December 1, 1816, to Cardinal Litta's letter repeating his decision not to accept the episcopate. The only reason why Archbishop Neale agreed with him in his decision was because the venerable old man was secretly hoping to have him appointed coadjutor-Archbishop of Baltimore, and Maréchal assured the Cardinal-Prefect that his attitude included all promotions which would take him away from his chosen task in St. Mary's Seminary. Cheverus should be selected, he says, for he could easily remain in Boston until the time came for him to succeed to Baltimore.³⁰ On Decem-

²⁷BCA, Case 12-R3.

²⁸Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 297, fol. 321.

²⁹Ibid., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 3, fol. 387.

³⁰Ibid., vol. 3, fol. 393.

ber 20, 1816, Neale asked formally for Maréchal as his coadjutor, and again urged the appointment of De Barth to Philadelphia.³¹

Philadelphia had been at this time two and a half years without a bishop. "During these years of waiting for a head," writes the diocesan historian Kirlin, "affairs did not go smoothly in Philadelphia. Fathers De Barth and McGirr officiated at St. Mary's; but as every day the news of the appointment of a bishop was expected, the administrator hesitated to act in matters which a bishop would have decided at once. Besides, routine work obliged him to be away from the city much of the time. Father McGirr seems to have been remarkable in no way as a preacher or organizer, and so parochial affairs simply drifted along. The unrest and national division among the people caused by the war had its effect on Church administration. Discipline, never much enforced because of the few priests and the distance from central authority, became more and more relaxed. All complaints of abuses and suggestions of remedies Father De Barth referred to the ever-expected and so long-delayed Bishop."³²

Probably the outstanding event in the diocese in the interregnum was the publication at Pittsburgh in 1816, of Prince Demetrius Gallitzin's *Defence of Catholic Principles in a Letter to a Protestant Minister*, a work quite worthy of place alongside Carroll's *Address to the Roman Catholics of the United States of America* (Annapolis, 1784), or Kohlmann's *True Exposition of the Sacrament of Penance* (New York, 1813), the best American Catholic apologetic literature up to that time.

The next year (1817) was to bring no change in the situation. The Puritan calm of Boston was but slightly ruffled by Bishop Cheverus; and in New York, which then seemed far away, Dr. Connolly was endeavoring to create peace in his own household. Archbishop Neale was in a losing fight with Propaganda over the evil-doers in Norfolk and Charleston. Bishop Flaget, as the Propaganda documents show, was wrestling with many problems of a minor nature which he was sending to the Holy See for settlement. The Holy See was preparing to create other episcopal centres in the Ohio Valley, the old Northwest,

³¹*Ibid.*, vol. 3, fol. 396.

³²"Catholicity in Philadelphia," p. 213. Philadelphia, 1909.

and in the Louisiana Purchase; and Maréchal, in fear and trembling, was deciding to accept the coadjutorship of the Provincial See. The triumph of Gallagher and Browne over the legitimate authority of Neale was a scandal to all Catholics in the United States, and Father Louis De Barth saw in the Charleston *débâcle* the signal to the malcontents of Philadelphia to set up the standard of revolt against all authority. "*Utinam metus iste vanus sit!*", he wrote to Neale, on April 9, 1817.³³ In a General Congregation of the Cardinals of Propaganda, held on May 19, 1817, Maréchal was nominated to Baltimore, and De Barth was favorably considered for Philadelphia. Du Bourg, who knew him personally, had told Propaganda that his modesty was such that without an express order from His Holiness, De Barth would certainly decline the episcopate.³⁴

Archbishop Neale's death, on June 18, 1817, removed a saintly prelate from the disturbed scene of American Catholic affairs, and Maréchal's consecration on December 14, of that year, brought to the chieftainship of American ecclesiastical affairs, a prelate who would be called upon to withstand the buffeting of the storms in practically every section of the province. The following year was a critical one in the history of episcopal authority in the United States. The subordinate groups were beginning to reach out to one another and to join their forces in an effort to break the control of the bishops in the matter of administration of Church property and in that of appointing and dismissing pastors to their congregations. In a letter, written January 2, 1818, to Cardinal Dugnani, Maréchal speaks rather frankly of his suspicion regarding the cause of much of the tension then existing between Propaganda and the Church in the United States; namely, that the American correspondence was being misused by certain religious "*auxquels est confié les mémoires et certificats venant d'Amérique pour être traduit de l'Anglois en Latin.*"³⁵

Sometime toward the end of 1817, the Catholic laity who were openly espousing the promotion of Harold to the See of Philadelphia, wrote to Archbishop Maréchal asking him to intervene in their behalf. Maréchal's answer is a characteristic one in

³³Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 5, fol. 77.

³⁴*Ibid.*, "Atti" (1817), fol. 11.

³⁵*Ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, fol. 42.

such situations, and displays the prudent and firm ecclesiastical superior:

Baltimore, 21st, January, 1818.

Gentlemen,

It appears to me from the reading of your letter that you are under the impression, that being Archbishop of Baltimore, I have some authority over the Diocese of Philadelphia. This is not however the case. The Spiritual jurisdiction with which I am now invested, does not extend beyond the limits of my own Diocese. Very likely His Holiness will before long send me the Pallium. As soon as I shall have received it, my Metropolitan powers will embrace the whole Catholic Church within the United States.

How extensive soever may be then my jurisdiction, yet I shall be limited in the exercise of it to certain circumstances and to certain specific objects determined by the positive laws of the Church. But I must tell you, Gentlemen, that the appointment of Pastors in the Dioceses of my Ecclesiastical province, will never devolve upon me. This weighty office exclusively belongs to the Bishop of each Diocese. Neither the Archbishop nor the Bishop of neighboring Dioceses, and much less mere laymen, have any right to interfere in that important and sacred business; and far from wishing to designate your own Pastors or even to concur in their nomination, permit me to observe to you, Gentlemen, you ought to rejoice that you are freed from an office of such awful responsibility. For the Salvation of Souls chiefly depends on the choice of proper Pastors.

As to the Rev. Mr. Harold, I am not sufficiently acquainted with him to pronounce whether it would be advantageous or not to Religion to invite him to Philadelphia. I have been once or twice in his company during a few hours. He appears to me a well informed and respectable clergyman. He certainly left a favorable opinion in my mind. But the heavy complaints which the good and venerable Bishop Egan and the illustrious Dr. Carroll have made against him, are sufficient reasons for me never to make use of my influence to draw him over to this country. I like better to see him in a country and in a place where I understand he proves useful to the Church, than to invite him to come to a city where he might be the cause (although innocent) of new troubles and disturbances. I am respectfully, Gentlemen,

Your Humble Servant,

✠AMBROSE MARÉCHAL,

*Archbishop of Baltimore.*³⁶

³⁶BCA, Case 22B-P2.

The better feeling which existed in Maréchal's heart towards Cardinal Litta began with the Cardinal-Prefect's letter of April 1, 1818. One phrase gave him courage at the outset, "*Je vous assure qu'on ne prendra aucune résolution ici qu'après vos conseils et mûre consideration.*"³⁷

In July, 1818, Propaganda, in answer to one of Dr. Connolly's letters (February 25-26, 1818), told the New York prelate that no further consideration of Harold for the vacant See of Philadelphia could be given. De Barth had been elected (*per Filadelfia è stato già eletto Monsignor Luigi de Barth, onde non può più aversi luogo il P. Harold*).³⁸ Maréchal's Report (October 16, 1818), although ostensibly confined to the Church in the Archdiocese of Baltimore, embraces some of the principal causes for the disorders, not the least of which is the attitude of some of the Irish clergy here towards their bishops.

We have an echo of the gossip of Philadelphia at the time in one of Carby's letters (November 22, 1818) to Father Faraldi, O.P., the Prior of Minerva. Rome was being rather severely condemned because the See of Philadelphia had been left vacant for almost five years, and especially for nominating the Frenchman, De Barth, who had refused to accept the See on account of the difficulties he would have as Bishop of Philadelphia. The Catholics of that city did not wish, Carby says, to hear about the discipline of the Church or about Canon law, and many of them held that only the civil law of the States should prevail in ecclesiastical affairs. Canon law would be accepted, if it conformed with the civil law; but not otherwise. Carby feared that if some concessions were not made to the American Catholics, the Church here would be extinct in twenty years (*In somma è da temersi, se il popolo non sia tranquillezzato, che prima da venti anni, o vi saranno pochissimi Cattolici in questa Repubblica, o si divideranno in due sette, l'una chiamadosi Cattolica Americana, e l'altra Papista Romana, e forse avranno due Vescovi in ogni Città, ovè adesso si trova uno*).³⁹

Propaganda had taken it for granted that Father De Barth was already consecrated, since episcopal faculties were sent to him as

³⁷BCA, Case Special B-K5.

³⁸Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 299, fol. 402.

³⁹*Ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, fol. 125.

Bishop of Philadelphia, on December 19, 1818.⁴⁰ When the Bulls arrived, however, De Barth firmly declined to receive them. He drew up a statement showing his deficiency for the post, and wrote to the Archbishop as follows: "I declare to you, Monseigneur, that if you do not forward my objections to the Holy See, and His Holiness sees and weighs them, I will not accept, but will kneel down and devoutly put the bulls in the fire, as we do with fragments of articles that have been blessed. Then I will make out testimonials for myself, signed in my real name, as Vicar-General, and give myself another name in the body of the paper, and then farewell, Monseigneur. Neither you nor any one else shall ever know the corner of the globe where I shall vegetate the few years still left me to live."⁴¹

Bishop Du Bourg thought there was still a way open in the Philadelphia situation, namely, the appointment of neither a French priest nor an Irish priest to that See, but of an American, and he suggested Father Benedict Fenwick, S. J., then 36 years old, "*homme à grands talens pour la prédication, et d'un caractère très prononcé, seroit je crois le seul à proposer.*" The whole trouble in the American Church, Du Bourg avers, comes from the Irish clergy—"On n'entend parler que de scandales donnés par leur excès." If Harold were to be appointed, Du Bourg predicts the end of Catholicism in the city of Philadelphia.⁴²

Father Harold's friends, however, were not idle. Once they learned that De Barth had refused the mitre, they asked Bishop Connolly to advise them. Dr. Connolly told them to draw up a Petition for the Holy See and to send it to Father James MacCormick, the Guardian of the Convent of San Isidore, in Rome. On June 14, 1819, this Petition was sent with the following letter, from Augustine Fagan, corresponding secretary to the Board of Trustees of St. Mary's Church:

The Right Rev. Dr. Connolly, of New York, having had the goodness to refer us to you, for the transaction of any affairs which the interests of our religion might require at Rome, I am directed by the Board of Trustees of St. Mary's Church, in this city, to request of you to have the enclosed

⁴⁰Ibid., "Lettere," vol. 299, fol. 783.

⁴¹Cited by Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 222 (not found in BCA).

⁴²Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 297, fol. 190.

Petition laid before His Holiness, and that you will use every means in your power to promote the object of it—which is, to defeat the designs of a French Jesuitical faction; who seem so anxious to possess themselves of our Churches and Church livings here, as ever the English were in the land of our forefathers.⁴³

The Italian version of the Petition repeats the whole story of Philadelphia troubles up to June 15, 1819. At the beginning of the year 1818, the trustees had petitioned the Holy See for the election of Father William Harold as their bishop. No answer had been received at the time they were drafting the Petition, and they feared that their former letter had not reached the hands of His Holiness. Father De Barth, "Gesuita Francese," had refused the vacant See, and consequently they desired to explain to His Holiness the advantages to religion in the event of Father Harold's election. They call the Holy Father's attention to the fact that, with the exception of Louisiana, almost all the Catholics in the United States are Irish, and they want priests and bishops of their own nationality. Irish bishops in American Sees would be a guarantee of a succession of priests from Ireland for parochial work. Already, owing to the mismanagement of the American Church under French bishops, the Irish are beginning to feel that there is no justice in Rome for them, and they are contemplating a National Convention to decide what should be done to relieve them of French tyranny. It would be well, therefore, for the Holy See to condescend to listen to the Petition before this final measure be agreed upon.⁴⁴

Archbishop Maréchal had this Petition against the French priests in mind when he wrote to Litta on September 18, 1819. Cardinal Litta had been succeeded in the office of Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda by Cardinal Fontana, and the Baltimore prelate very much regretted the change. When he wrote to Litta, therefore, rather than to Fontana, it was, as we have seen, with the hope that the former would assist him in placing exact information before the Sacred Congregation. Maréchal never had any doubt about the causes underlying the Irish-French animosity—the tur-

⁴³*Ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, fol. 269.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, vol. 4, fol. 264. A copy of the original (English) Petition is in the Prop. Arch., *ibid.*, vol. 6, no. 23.

bulent spirit of the Irish, enjoying for the first time in many centuries of their history an independence they were not ready for. All other complaints—the lack of facility in preaching in English; the desire to keep the Irish clergy out of the best places in the missions; the effort to absorb all the episcopal Sees—were sheer pretexts. If what the Irish malcontents say were true, he adds, then what about the situation in Philadelphia, where, under Egan, both bishop and priests were Irish; what about New York, where the bishop and priests were Irish? What shall be said of the Irish Dominican Carbrý? What of Egan? So argued Maréchal; and he told Litta that the remedy was not in a balance of power between Irish and French priests, but in securing a national American clergy, from St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore. If only both sides be patient, in a few years their places would be filled with Americans. Meanwhile, he must use the instruments Providence had given him. English and Scottish priests he will gladly receive—*“mais quant aux Irlandais, la prudence demand que je ne les reçoive qu'avec grande précaution; car, quoique je bénisse le Ciel d'en avoir quelques-uns pleins de zèle et de piété, il nous arrivent tant de mauvais que nous ne pouvons les employer, sans exposer la religion dans ce pays-cy à des maux extrêmes, qu'après de longues expériences.”*⁴⁵

From Lisbon about this time (June 16, 1819) came another letter in favor of Father Harold, from his old friend and companion in the Philadelphia mission under Bishop Egan, Father John Ryan, O. P. Harold was so much upset by the disturbed conditions in Philadelphia, that he asked Ryan to write to the Sacred Congregation to say that he was willing to accept the burden of the episcopate there in order to settle the whole disorder—*“videns gravissima incommoda quae passa est (et quae adhuc patitur) viduata ecclesia, petit ut iterum scribam ad Eminum. Cardinalem se esse paratum ad subendum oneri episcopali, si ad hoc opus a Sancta Sede nominaretur.”* Ryan had just heard that a Portuguese nobleman had presented Father Connor O'Hay for the vacant See; and then he adds a paragraph or two for the Cardinal-Prefect's benefit to prove the unworthiness of O'Hay for the post.⁴⁶

⁴⁵Prop. Arch., “Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.,” vol. 4, fol. 322.

⁴⁶*Ibid.*, vol. 4, no. 91.

In August, 1819, in the particular congregation for American affairs, the Cardinals of Propaganda Fide took up all the correspondence on the subject of the situation in Philadelphia, and special attention was paid to the Petitions of January 28, 1818, and June 14, 1819, from the trustees, asking for Father Harold. Likewise, special reflection was given to the threat of a General Catholic Convention to assert the rights of the Irish in the United States. Harold had been recommended by many—Archbishop Troy, of Dublin; John Ryan, O.P.; James Harold; and now the trustees. Others mentioned were Father Patrick Connor O'Hay, recommended by the Secretary of State of the Portuguese Government, and Father Bonaventure Maguire, O.F.M., whom Maréchal had praised so highly in his letter of December 26, 1818. The *dubium* was asked: Whether the resignation of Monsignor De Barth, Bishop-Elect of Philadelphia, be accepted, and who should be substituted in his place—Harold or another? The first part of the question was answered in the affirmative; the second was left to the Cardinal-Prefect to decide.⁴⁷ Some time later (August 28, 1819)—it is not certain whether Propaganda had Philadelphia in mind—Archbishop Troy was asked by the Sacred Congregation to give his opinion on Father James Cowan, Provincial of the Franciscans in Ireland, as a possible candidate for an American See. If Troy knew any other Irish priests, who seemed to him worthy of this dignity, he was requested to send their names and a statement of their qualities.⁴⁸ This was asking the Dublin metropolitan to do exactly what he had promised Maréchal would not be done in the future. There is no document in the Propaganda Archives to show that Troy replied to this letter. Cardinal Fontana was doing his best to settle the Philadelphia difficulties. On September 11, 1819, he wrote to Maréchal, that the See would soon be filled, but Harold would not be appointed. He had heard splendid things about Benedict Fenwick, S.J., and Maréchal was asked to give an opinion on his worthiness for the episcopal dignity.

In October Father Harold had heard a rumor of his appointment to Philadelphia, and wrote to Archbishop Murray, of

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, "Atti" (1815), ff. 177-178.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 300, fol. 575.

Dublin, asking whether it were true. The answer (November 11, 1819) was as follows:

Dear Mr. Harold,

I lose not a moment in replying to your kind and friendly letter of the 19th ult., which I have only just received, and regret extremely to be obliged to state that the rumour which reached you is not founded. The Catholics of Philadelphia did petition the See of Rome for your appointment in the strongest terms. Their petition was sent to me, and was forwarded through Dr. Troy to the Holy See. I have lately heard confidentially that the Cardl. prefect of Propaganda had intended to propose you for the See of Philadelphia to the Genl. Congregation and that the papers for that purpose were in actual preparation; but that the interposition of high Ecclesl. authority from America caused him to give up the idea. It may be necessary for you to know from what quarter this interposition came. I will tell it to you therefore in the same confidential way in which I heard it; the name which was mentioned to me was that of Dr. Maréchal. I must add that I heard of no complaint urged by him against you, except your disagreement with some of the higher Clergy in America. Should you at any time have occasion to write to Mr. Fagan of Philadelphia, with whom perhaps you are acquainted, I pray you to present him my respects and to assure him that I executed faithfully the commission, which, in the name of the Catholics of that City, he forwarded to me, and that it would be most grateful to my feelings to be enabled to congratulate him on his success.

It seems that there are very serious differences between some of the Catholic laity of America and their French Pastors, and that the former have very decided preference for Irish Clergy. I do not think that the Holy See is disinclined to listen favourably to the wishes of the people or this head. I believe an addition to Bishopricks in the United States is in contemplation, but the French will certainly endeavour to keep them as much as possible amongst themselves.

I am just preparing to leave town, I have only time to request you to present my best regards to your Uncle and Mr. Ryan, and to assure you of the sincere esteem with which I am, dear Mr. Harold,

Your faithful humble servant,

✠ D. MURRAY.⁴⁹

⁴⁹Dominican Archives at Tallaght.

When Father John Ryan, O. P., heard the rumor at Lisbon, that his friend had been definitely excluded from the nomination to Philadelphia, he wrote (probably to the Archbishop of Bordeaux) a letter of vindication in favor of Father Harold. This letter, published *in extenso*, in the "Life and Times of John Carroll," must not be overlooked by anyone who wishes to do justice to the memory of a Dominican whose name is held in veneration today in Dublin. But no influence would avail in Harold's favor, so long as Archbishop Maréchal believed him to be of the same mind in ecclesiastical discipline as others who were disturbing the peace of the American Church. It began to look as if another year would pass without a settlement of the Philadelphia situation, when, suddenly, without apparently any preliminary discussion and without waiting for a reply from Archbishop Maréchal, the new Prefect of Propaganda, Cardinal Fontana, appointed as Bishop of Philadelphia Father Henry Conwell, of the parish of Dungannon, Vicar-General of the Archdiocese of Armagh, Ireland. The Bulls for his consecration were asked on November 12, 1819.⁵⁰

Henry Conwell was born in 1745, at Moneymore, Ireland. He was ordained to the priesthood in 1776, after a brilliant course of studies in the Irish College, Paris, where his family had founded a scholarship. In 1784-85, he made application through a friend in Philadelphia for a post in America.⁵¹ No reply seems to have been made to this letter, and shortly afterwards Conwell was made Parish-Priest of Dungannon. Dr. O'Reilly, Archbishop of Armagh and Primate of All Ireland, appointed him Vicar-General about 1795; and on the Primate's death, on November 11, 1817, Father Conwell was the unanimous choice of the priests of the Archdiocese as Dr. O'Reilly's successor.⁵² Dr. Patrick Curtis, who for forty years had been President of the Irish College of Salamanca, had been the preceptor of the remaining three Archbishops of Ireland, and they presented his name as successor to the See. The British Government had taken exception to Dr.

⁵⁰Prop. Arch., "Lettère," vol. 300, fol. 822.

⁵¹Cf. *Researches* (Griffin), vol. V, pp. 41-42.

⁵²Brady, *Episcopal Succession etc.*, vol. 1, p. 231. On Conwell's qualifications for the primacy, cf. reference in Cogan, "Diocese of Meath," vol. III, p. 678.

Conwell's stand on political matters and its influence with Cardinal Consalvi is believed to have brought about the election of Dr. Curtis on August 2, 1819. The Sacred Congregation then offered to Dr. Conwell either the See of Madras or of Philadelphia. He selected the latter.

In a letter to Father O'Finan, on receipt of the news of his appointment, Dr. Conwell said that the thought of abandoning his flock in Dungannon was naturally a very painful one, but if the Holy See needed his services in the United States he was willing to accept the See of Philadelphia. He feared however that the situation in the Philadelphia Church was a serious one both from the canonical and financial standpoint. One had but to reflect on the sad state the trustees had created in the New York Church and how difficult it was for Dr. Connolly to live. That prelate hardly was able to buy enough wood for his fire. "Contrast that with my flock here," he says. He suggests then that the Holy See permit him as Bishop of Philadelphia to hold the parish of Dungannon as a benefice *in commendam*.⁵³

This letter was presented to Propaganda by Father O'Finan, and on February 29, 1820, the Sacred Congregation replied, complimenting the venerable priest, he was then in his seventy-fifth year, on his spirit of self-sacrifice in placing himself at the disposal of the Holy See for the arduous work in Philadelphia. Propaganda would assist him in the expenses of his journey across the Atlantic, and the Archbishop of Armagh would be asked to help him. The Cardinals had no fear that the Philadelphia Catholics would prove ungenerous towards their new bishop. Dr. Conwell was then urged to arrange immediately for his consecration and to leave as soon as possible for the United States.

Some of the contemporary correspondence throws additional light on Conwell's appointment, and the first of these letters gives us a rather curious insight into the mind of the Primate of All Ireland, who was Conwell's successful rival for the Archiepiscopal See of Armagh. Dr. Curtis writes to Monsignor Argenti, Under-Secretary of Propaganda, from Drogheda, February 14, 1820:

. . . All this is a slight matter and soon finished. But the same cannot be said, Monsignor Argenti, of that which remains for us to treat here. With your letter of the 15th of

⁵³Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, ff. 345-347.

last month, I also received one of the same date from His Eminence, the Cardinal Prefect, and with all the respect due rightly to his dignity, place and person, but not without the greatest astonishment and regret His Eminence began by supposing I was already informed that Rev. Henry Conwell—Parish Priest of Dungannon, in this diocese—had been nominated Bishop of Philadelphia by the Sovereign Pontiff. I had, in truth, heard talk of this, some time ago, but without attaching to it the least credit—persuaded that the thing was almost as impossible as to believe that he had been made Emperor of China. Nevertheless, in the course of last week, Msgr. Troy assured me, with the greatest surprise and sorrow, that it was a certain fact, and that Conwell had made it public. Those of my confrères whom I have seen lately, and many of the principal clergy—justly indignant at so dangerous and revolting an example—have begged me as Archbishop of Conwell, to represent the truth in all its nakedness to the Sacred Congregation, which had been so infamously deceived by intrigues and insidious manoeuvres and which would be incapable of choosing for the Episcopate a subject so ill-fitted, if it had the least suspicion that during the long period of years when he was Parish Priest, his ordinary custom was to travel—to rush here and there through France, England, Scotland and Ireland, outside his parish, in which he did not reside, as he was obliged to, to care for the souls entrusted to his charge; and all this without having obtained—not even asked the permission of his ecclesiastical Superiors—at least to avoid the shocking scandal.

Although I knew that these complaints and others were well-founded, I had no wish to address them directly to the Sacred Congregation; on the contrary I would be content to recommend Mr. Conwell, as I had done in the case of Dr. McCann, because I saw that he was worthy of it—but yet I ask you to present this letter when you find it convenient, and to confine yourself to it.

The said letter to His Eminence remarked, besides, that Conwell had asked and obtained from the Holy See permission to retain the sums which he had received for the future Archbishop, during the vacancy of the See, maintaining that they came from matrimonial charges and as he himself said, he had applied them to the Church and other pious uses; but that, before he had been instructed by the said Papal concession, he had been obliged to pay me about £100 sterling for the reason indicated and which would reduce him to misery if I did not make him some compensation.

It is astonishing how an aged priest, of 74 years, could

have the audacity to utter so many falsehoods to the Holy See. It is utterly false that Conwell paid me about £100, or that the little sum he gave me—less than half of that which he received—came from the marriage fees, as he invidiously said. They came, principally at least, from the annual contributions—called Cathedraticum or proxies—of the pastors of the fourteen neighboring parishes. That he has given the said money to the Church and other pious works, is false and even ridiculous. A vagabond or non-resident Pastor, never does anything so miraculous, although bound more than anybody to restitution. To cut short these scandalous lies, let him furnish proof of having made these pious largesses, and I promise not only to repay them, but also to give him during my life the income of the Archdiocese. However it is enough for me that the Sacred Congregation has recommended to me Mr. Conwell, he shall never more have occasion to complain of me, although I am poorer than he.

I have the honour to be, Monsignor,

✠ P. CURTIS.

*Drogheda, 14 Feb., 1820.*⁵⁴

Another interesting letter is one signed by a group of eighteen priests of the Dungannon district, advising Conwell against leaving the Archdiocese of Armagh:

We, the undersigned Parish Priests, & Administrators of the Archdiocese of Armagh, & district of Dungannon, having lately learned that our highly respected, and justly beloved friend, the Revd. Doctor Henry Conwell who has for 24 years filled the situation of Superior & vicar of this District, with honour to himself and satisfaction to us, has been appointed Bishop of Philadelphia, most humbly beg leave to offer him our candid and sincere advice on that subject: we are well acquainted with his constitution & period of life, and from our knowledge of these circumstances have reason to apprehend he might soon fall a victim to some of these diseases which frequently rage with such fury in the new world. We therefore entreat him to resign that excellent, & highly dignified station & spend the remainder of his days in his native land. *Given under our hands at Dungannon this 22d February, 1820.*⁵⁵

Dr. Conwell decided, however, to accept the episcopate and wrote accordingly to Cardinal Fontana, from Dungannon, March

⁵⁴*Ibid.*, vol. 4, no. 143. Printed in the *Catholic Historical Review*, vol. VI, p. 262.

⁵⁵*Ibid.*, vol. 4, fol. 359.

25, 1820. After serious considerations of the burdens the bishopric would impose upon him and of his own advanced age, he felt that the call to Philadelphia was one from God and that with God's help he would succeed in the new post. He wished to go to Rome or Paris to be consecrated—"quod Episcopus consecratus Romae aut Parisiis habetur a Fidelibus, in ista plaga mundi, magis privilegiatus et magis munitus facultatibus quam si consecratus fuisset alibi, praesertim in Hibernia. . . ." ⁵⁶ He was then leaving for London, and would await the Bulls, faculties, etc., there. Archbishop Maréchal had not then received the news of Conwell's election to Philadelphia, since he wrote to Fontana, on April 4, 1820, asking that Prince Gallitzin be appointed quickly to the vacant See. ⁵⁷ Nor had the friends of Harold given up hope, for Archbishop Murray sends on a defence of the Dublin Dominican on April 25, 1820. ⁵⁸ An interesting note occurs in this letter, that the bearer avoid the mistake of having it reach the Cardinal-Prefect through Father O'Finan, who was not trusted by Murray. He is the same agent whom Maréchal suspected of diverting the American correspondence with Propaganda. Maréchal wrote again (April 28, 1820) to Fontana, giving a list of the candidates agreed upon by the American bishops for the new Sees and for Philadelphia: ⁵⁹

<i>Siège:</i>	<i>Evêques:</i>
Charleston	Mr. Benedict Fenwick
Philadelphia	Demetrius Gallitzin
Cincinnati	{ 1° loco, RR.DD. David
	{ 2° loco, Edwardus Fenwick ex
	{ Dominicanorum familia.
Detroit près du Canada	{ 1° Dns. Richard, pastor hujus
	{ 2° civitatis
	{ D. Lartique, professor in
	{ Seminario Canadiensi
	{ 3° Joseph Rosati

On April 29, 1820, Propaganda replied to Conwell's last letter, and sent him the apostolic letters necessary for his consecration. He was free to be consecrated where he wished, and the Sacred

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, vol. 4, fol. 210.

⁵⁷*Ibid.*, vol. 4, 403.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, vol. 4, fol. 404.

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, "Atti" (1821), fol. 204.

Congregation would be glad to talk over affairs with him, if he came to Rome.⁶⁰ In Maréchal's next letter to Fontana (June 28, 1820), all the other Sees were discussed and new ones suggested, but there is nothing about Philadelphia.⁶¹ Dr. Conwell in *itinere* informed the Cardinal-Prefect, on August 1, 1820, that Bishop Poynter, Vicar-Apostolic of the London District, to whose care the apostolic letters had been entrusted, had invited him to come to London for consecration, "*sine mora aut ulla hesitatione sed propria manu mihi consulit venire Londinum et ulterius non progredi et quod ipse libenter susciperet obire functionem consecrationis.*"⁶² Dr. Conwell accepted this generous invitation, settled upon the Feast of St. Bartholomew, August 24, 1820, for his consecration, and decided to go to Philadelphia immediately afterwards.⁶³

In answer to the Petition sent by the Augustinian Fagan on June 14-15, 1818, the Sacred Congregation wrote to the *Catholicorum Philadelphiæ congregationi universæ*, informing them that from the information received, not from Archbishop Maréchal alone, but from Ireland itself, it was decided that Father Harold did not possess those qualities which were necessary for the episcopate. But in order to satisfy their wish to have an Irish prelate rule over them, Propaganda had selected a priest from the Archdiocese of Armagh (one indeed who had been nominated by the priests there as Primate of All Ireland), for the widowed See of Philadelphia. Moreover, the Holy See had chosen two other Irish priests, Dr. England and Dr. Kelly, for the two new Sees of the Southland. These three nominations would be sufficient evidence that the Holy See was not influenced by the "French Junta" in the United States itself, if such a group existed. Then follows a severe reprimand on the right claimed by the Philadelphia trustees to elect their own pastors and bishops. Every one is free to advise the Holy See in such matters, but no right exists or ever can exist whereby the appointment of a pastor rests with the laity.⁶⁴

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 301, fol. 283.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, "Atti" (1821), ff. 205-208.

⁶²*Ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, fol. 206.

⁶³From documents published in the *Records* (ACHS), vol. XXIV, pp. 163-166, it is evident that Conwell was consecrated on Sept. 24, 1820.

⁶⁴Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 301, fol. 859.

The appointment of Dr. Conwell was announced to Archbishop Maréchal in letters dated June 26, September 11, and November 11, 1820, and the Baltimore metropolitan was asked to receive the new Bishop of Philadelphia as well as Bishops England and Kelly with all cordiality: "*Et advenientes episcopos tua gratia, consilio, ac patrocínio prosequi velit, fraternamque cum iis concordiam servare.*"⁶⁵

A last echo of the disappointment felt by the friends of Father Harold is found in a letter written by Harold himself, who was then in Rome, dated December 2, 1820, to Cardinal Fontana. "Trusting in your justice," he writes, "I ask for one thing, to reopen my case from the beginning, and to re-examine all that has been said and written against me. I enclose a letter and would ask you to study it, before passing judgment on me and on my calumniators." The letter contains little that is new, but it shows that Father Harold had taken very much to heart the accusations made against him in the discussions preliminary to Dr. Conwell's appointment. One strong point in his favor was Carroll's high esteem for him, and another was a recent appeal made by Bishop Connolly that he return to America. He came to Rome, he writes, to vindicate his reputation and he asked the privilege of returning to America with those proofs of benevolence and confidence on the part of the Holy See which would remove all suspicion from his name.⁶⁶

On the very day this letter was written, Bishop Conwell arrived in Philadelphia and took possession of his See. His appearance at High Mass, the following morning (Sunday, December 3) was a great joy to all his flock. The long delay was ended at last and on all sides the feeling prevailed that the troubles of the past six years were over and that a new life had begun. The Sunday morning was, however, to witness not the close of Philadelphia's sad uncertainty but the beginning of one of the most turbulent episodes in the American Church. The preacher on this solemn occasion was Father William Hogan, who had been accepted into the diocese by the Administrator, Father De Barth. "On this

⁶⁵*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 301, fol. 856.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, "Atti" (1821), ff. 183-185. During his stay in Rome that Father Harold, penned a long and valuable memorandum on Church affairs in the United States.

occasion he made a severe and sour attack on Father De Barth, then seated in the very sanctuary to which he had admitted Father Hogan as pastor . . . just what the preacher then said in the guise of personal attacks, has not been preserved in any of the records."⁶⁷ Hogan's reputation had been sullied before the coming of Dr. Conwell; and the venerable prelate, though cognizant of these murmurings against the pastor of St. Mary's, prudently did no more at the time than to suggest the advisability of his living in community with other priests. This Father Hogan flatly refused to do, and in a sermon on the following Sunday (December 10), used such offensive language that Dr. Conwell could not hesitate to take action. On Tuesday, December 12, 1820, the bishop called the priests of the city to his house, and in their presence withdrew Hogan's faculties. On December 14, 1820, Father Hogan wrote to Archbishop Maréchal his statement of the affair at St. Mary's:

Most Revd. Sir,

An unpleasant circumstance has occurred since the arrival of our hearty Bishop—it is the following precisely: on last Sunday I imprudently & unthinkingly mentioned from the pulpit that there were now three clergymen in the parish & that I would preach every Sunday in the afternoon and every third Sunday morning. The Bishop conceived this an insult offered to him, & on the day following, without requiring an explanation or giving me any admonition suspended me in presence of three priests for *attempting to cause a schism*. Allow me to request your Lordship's interference, otherwise scandals must arise inevitably & religion will be the victim. Meetings are already taking place as in the time of the Rev. ———. I cannot prevent them, and therefore beg of you in the name of the founder of our Holy Religion to interfere— May I beg of your Lordship to recollect that since my arrival here machinations have been on foot to injure me by some of the priests. They represented the worthy Mr. De Barth to me as anything but a good priest, & they represented me to him as something worse. They have represented me as ——— proud and imperious, as fond of society & everything bad. Our Bishop had scarce been among us when they came round him in like manner. But, Most Revd. Sir, no matter what injury I suffer, I will bear it for the love of God. I am satisfied to become the victim, if re-

⁶⁷*Records* (ACHS), vol. XXIV, p. 167.

ligion is shielded by your interference. Our good Bishop little knows the fatal effects of meetings of the Laity in this Country—allow me again to request your interference. Some hundreds of the people have met last night, reports are alarming. I am satisfied to do anything to prevent scandal. If he would even allow me to resume my faculties for a time & quiet the present tumults, I would shortly resign and quietly retire from this City to some other mission. I never ambitioned stopping here. I will expect your Lordship's answer as soon as you think proper.

Your Lordship's humble servant,

WM. HOGAN.⁶⁸

Efforts were made by leading Catholic members of the congregation (Mark Frenaye, John T. Sullivan, John Doyle, and others) to bring about a reconciliation between Father Hogan and the Bishop. But Dr. Conwell would not recede from his stand in the matter. He was determined to be rid of Father Hogan, who would, he said, "be a very useful man in any other diocese." The breach was now open; the long scandalous history of the Hogan schism began. A dreary, uninteresting, and highly disheartening path now opens up for anyone who has the desire and the courage to make his way through the shoal of pamphlets published from December 20, 1820, until the coming of Francis Patrick Kenrick, in 1830, as coadjutor-Bishop of Philadelphia.

The election of the trustees of St. Mary's (Easter Week, 1821) placed that church in the hands of a Hogan majority, and Bishop Conwell abandoned his pro-Cathedral to those who rebelled against his action in the case of the misguided priest. On May 27, 1821, Hogan was publicly excommunicated from the altar of St. Augustine's Church, and before the month was out, a schismatic congregation had been formed in the abandoned Cathedral. Schism, sometimes quickly, sometimes slowly, inevitably leads to heresy, and with the publication of an adulterated edition of Butler's *Catechism* by Father Hogan, heretical tendencies became visible.

⁶⁸BCA, Case 17-J11.

II

TRUSTEEISM IN NEW YORK

(1815-1821)

New York needed a bishop's care, direction, and jurisdiction more than any other city of the United States during the five years which followed the death of its first Ordinary, Dr. Concanen, at Naples, on June 19, 1810. Its Catholic congregation was composed of a goodly mixture of cultured Irish, French, and Spanish; and had it been from the outset carefully welded by discipline and by power into a compact American diocese, the evils which linked its flock with the disturbing groups of Philadelphia, Charleston, and Norfolk, might never have arisen. It is quite probable that, had New York possessed real leadership, the Catholic group there—bishops, priests and people—might have given the keynote to an orthodox adaptation of old world customs to the new Catholic life in the United States. Our purpose is to sketch briefly the disorderly trustee system of New York during the first six years of Bishop Connolly's episcopate.

Had Bishop Concanen been spared to reach his diocese, writes O'Daniel, "much good for the Church in our American metropolis, in spite of his years, might have been expected from his zeal, good judgment, and experience, his learning and amiable temperament. The young Diocese of New York might have been spared a long and sad widowhood. That Doctor Concanen was a man of singularly exalted character and admirable disposition is the verdict from many sources. His friendships and the high esteem in which he was held by two saintly Popes, by the Sacred Congregation at Rome, and by learned prelates in various parts of the world, and his own Order; the universal confidence reposed in him and the honours that were thrust upon him; the affection that he unconsciously won from persons in every walk of life—all these declare his praise in a way that cannot be misunderstood."⁶⁹

⁶⁹"Concanen's Election to the See of New York," article in the *Cath. Hist. Rev.*, vol. 11, p. 45.

Concanen's legacy of high-minded zeal for the Church of God in Ireland and in the United States was handed on to his successor in the Priorship of San Clemente, Father John Connolly, O. P., whom Concanen had strongly recommended in 1808, for the See of New York. Father John Connolly's career in Rome was almost as remarkable as that of his friend and predecessor. He was a native of Drogheda, Ireland, where he was born about the year 1750. After completing his elementary studies in Drogheda, he was sent to Liège for the classics and philosophy, and later to Rome, where he entered the Dominican Order. The next forty years of his life were to be spent in the Eternal City, where he became one of the prominent scholars of his day. His most important post was that of librarian of the Minerva or Casanatensian Library. Later (1808) he succeeded Bishop Concanen as Prior of the great Dominican House of San Clemente and in his office of agent for the Bishops of Ireland; in fact, it would seem that Dr. Concanen had shared the work of his agency with Father Connolly for some years previous to this.⁷⁰

Bishop Connolly's consecration took place at Rome on November 6, 1814. The date of his departure from Rome is uncertain. He was there late in December, 1814, for we have a letter to a fellow-Dominican, of Cork, Father Dennis Lane, written from Rome on December 29, 1814, in which he says: "I purpose setting off about the end of next month for our native country, to embark there, or in England, for North America, in consequence of my having been appointed Bishop of New York, as you may perhaps have known from the Rt. Revd. Dr. Coppinger."⁷¹

On February 1, 1815, he wrote a last letter to his patron, Bishop Plunket, of Meath, announcing that he was to leave Rome about the middle of that month, "I am to delay about a month in the diocese of Liège," he writes, "where I am pressingly requested, by the vicar of the chapter of that city, to arrive for Holy Week,

⁷⁰Cogan, "Diocese of Meath," vol. III, pp. 345-349, where Connolly is called "the Roman Agent"; cf. Hughes, "The Right Rev. Bishop Connolly etc." Fribourg, 1926.

⁷¹Dominican Archives at Tallaght. Bishop Connolly writes in this letter: "Mr. Gaddi, our present Vicar-General, made me Doctor of Casanatense and Socius to himself, in September, 1808. But the French having come here soon after, destroyed all such regulations. They ordered me thrice to go to Paris, because thrice I spurned at their proposals to me to swear allegiance to Buonaparte."

in order to consecrate the Holy Oils, and afterwards to administer the sacrament of confirmation in different parts of that vast diocese, now many years without a bishop."⁷² He hoped to arrive in Ireland in May, when he intended visiting Dr. Plunket, at Navan, and receiving from him "instructions that will be useful to me at New York, of which I have been appointed and consecrated bishop, though conscious of my unfitness for such a dignity."

Towards the end of June, 1815, he reached Dublin, in company with Bishop Murphy of Cork. On July 1, 1815, he wrote to his friend, Father Lane, to secure him a passage "on some good ship being prepared to sail from Cork for New York." Eventually, he sailed from Dublin, on a "fine vessel of 350 tons," about the middle of September. While he was in Ireland he visited St. John's College, Kilkenny, where Father Patrick Kelly, the future Bishop of Richmond, was President, and secured the services of Father Michael O'Gorman, whom he ordained for the Diocese of New York. Father O'Gorman was his companion on the voyage to New York, where they arrived after a long and unpleasant journey across the Atlantic, on November 24, 1815. There is nothing in Dr. Connolly's correspondence to show that he was aware of the condition of war between England and the United States. At any rate, had he been interested in his status as American bishop and British subject, the signing of the Treaty of Ghent, in December, 1814,

⁷²Cogan, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 412. In reply to a letter sent to the Bishop of Liège, on January 19, 1924, regarding Dr. Connolly's episcopal acts in that Diocese, Dr. Laminne writes to me: "J'ai bien reçu votre lettre du 19 Janvier. Voici la réponse à la première de vos questions: Mgr. Zoepfel l'évêque nommé à la suite du Concordat, mourut en 1808. Lejeas, nommé par Napoleon, alors en lutte avec le S. Siège, pour lui succéder, n'obtint pas l'institution canonique. Il disparut en 1814. Barrett devint alors Vicaire Capitulaire (en remplacement de Henrard Vicaire Capitulaire depuis 1808, mort en 1814). Guillaume I, roi des Pays Bas, fut en désaccord avec Rome et ne fit un Concordat qu'en 1827. A la suite de ce Concordat qui ne fut pas exécuté immédiatement, Mgr. Van Bonemel fut nommé l'évêque en 1829. Malheureusement nous n'avons rien ici concernant le second point: travail de Connolly. Notre registre d'ordination commence en 1817 et encore ne renseigne-t-il pas le nom de l'évêque qui a conféré les ordres." Cf. Shea, *op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 175 note. Bishop Zoepfel died on October 17, 1808, and the See remained vacant until 1829. The Vicar-Capitular, Father Barrett, Dr. Connolly's friend, applied to the Government on April 15-27, 1815, for permission to have the newly-consecrated prelate perform episcopal acts in that Diocese.

removed any fears he may have had. He had caught a bad cold on the journey over and this kept him confined to his room for several weeks after his arrival.

The Diocese of New York in 1815, embraced the whole State of New York and the northern half of the State of New Jersey. The number of Catholics in that large stretch of territory at the time was about 13,000. The religious status of the diocese is given by Dr. Connolly in a letter addressed to Propaganda, on February 25, 1818. It contains a restatement for the Sacred Congregation of letters written in 1815, but which had gone astray. "My voyage hither," he writes, "in sixty-seven days from Dublin in stormy weather was painful and at times dangerous. A report prevailed (in New York) that I was lost at sea. I found about 13,000 Catholics here, with only three Jesuits and Father Carbry to attend them, and I was soon deprived of two of the Jesuits and thereby forced to discharge both night and day duties of a parish priest or vicar more than those of a bishop until I received lately three good priests from Ireland. At present (1818), there are here about 16,000 Catholics, mostly Irish, and at least 10,000 Irish Catholics arrived in New York during the past three years. They spread through all the States of this Republic and make their religion known everywhere."⁷³

Changes of a significant nature had taken place between his arrival in 1815 and the date of this letter. On taking possession of his diocese, Bishop Connolly found that the priests at his disposal for the missions were: Fathers Benedict Fenwick, S. J., Peter Malou, S. J., Maximilian Rantzau, S. J., Father Thomas Carbry, O. P., whom he had known during his student days at the Minerva, Rome, and Father Michael Carroll. A rather good description of the condition of Catholicism in New York at the time is given by Bishop Plessis in the account of his journey to the United States in September, 1815. Plessis reached New York City on September 9-10, 1815, and was hospitably received by Andrew Morris, the richest Catholic in the city, one of the trustees of the two churches of St. Peter and St. Patrick, and at the time the only Catholic member of Assembly in the legislature of the State of New York. Another friend of one of the priests who

⁷³Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, no. 21.

accompanied Plessis was Lewis Willcocks, the son-in-law of Mr. Morris. When they arrived at the home of Mr. Morris, they found Father Fenwick waiting to receive them. They visited the Bowery and rode along Broadway, "the marvel of New York," as Plessis calls it, and were amazed at the great crowds of people passing up and down that historic thoroughfare. Plessis gives the number of Catholics as 15,000. The Church was then being administered by Father Kohlmann, who had been chosen by the American prelates at their meeting in Baltimore (1810), as administrator of the diocese for the interim. The juridic situation was a singular one, from the standpoint of Canon Law. The Bishops of the United States had the right to name an administrator for the vacant diocese, but when Father Kohlmann was recalled (March, 1815) to Whitemarsh as Master of Novices, he named Father Fenwick as his successor.⁷⁴ This he had no power to do; only the bishops of the country could have appointed Father Fenwick.

Though Father Rantzau, S. J., was sent to assist Father Fenwick in the New York mission, it was evident at the time that the Society of Jesus had decided to close the New York Literary Institution, a classical school for boys, and a forerunner to the Jesuit schools to come later, Fordham University and St. Francis Xavier College.⁷⁵ It is interesting to note that, whether he possessed the canonical right of administratorship or not, Bishop Cheverus accepted Father Fenwick's invitation to dedicate the Cathedral (Old St. Patrick's) on May 4, 1815. There is no doubt that during Plessis' visit, this problem of jurisdiction was discussed by the priests, since there is an echo of the same in the *Visites Pastorales*.⁷⁶ The Bishop of Quebec praises the new

⁷⁴Cf. *United States Catholic Historical Magazine*, vol. III, p. 221.

⁷⁵Cf. Guilday, "Carroll," pp. 637-639.

⁷⁶Têtu in the "Visites Pastorales etc.," discusses the problem (p. 160): "On peut répondre à ces questions comme suite: 1er., Les Evêques des Etats-Unis devaient avoir le pouvoir de nommer un administrateur et c'est ce qu'ils firent en designant le P. Kohlmann; 2me., celui-ci n'avait pas le droit de se nommer un successeur, en quittant son poste; 3me., les évêques purent confier le gouvernement du diocèse au P. Fenwick, comme ils avaient fait auparavant pour le P. Kohlmann; 4me., l'évêque voisin ne pouvait pas administrer le diocèse de New York, sans une délégation de qui de droit. On voit par les lettres de Mgr. Carroll, de Mgr. Flaget et de Mgr. Cheverus qu'à cette époque les nominations épiscopales se faisaient à Rome, non sur l'avis et à la demande des Evêques des Etats-

Church of St. Patrick, and considers it for the New World a magnificent edifice, in fact "la plus belle des Etats-Unis." The difficulty of maintaining two churches in the "parish" of New York was augmented by the fact that neither Father Malou nor Father Rantzau preached in English. In spite of Father Kohlmann's appeal for the New York Literary Institution, the school was closed, and the Jesuit missionary period in New York was drawing to a close.⁷⁷ When Father Fenwick was recalled, Bishop Connolly realized that his most pressing difficulty was the need of priests.

The Trappists who had come to New York had left before the arrival of the Bishop, and some Ursuline nuns from Cork had closed their academy for girls in the spring of 1815, and had retired to Ireland. It may well be doubted if in the history of the Catholic Church in the United States any other bishop began his episcopal life under such disheartening conditions. Without priests to send to the growing congregations from New York to Buffalo, Bishop Connolly faced a situation which demanded rare courage and foresight. He was then more than sixty-five years of age, and for a priest who had spent about forty years among books and amid the pleasant surroundings of Rome, his self-sacrificing zeal must ever remain one of the noblest pages in the history of Catholicism in this country.

The ten years of Bishop Connolly's episcopate in New York have been variously judged. John Gilmary Shea's estimate is clouded by a false vision of Irish influence in his election to the New York See and by the opinion that owing to his allegiance to the English crown, his appointment to an American See was "a grave national discourtesy."⁷⁸ This can be passed over without

Unis, mais au gout et au choix de Mgr. Troy, archevêque de Dublin qui, étant dominicain lui-même, designait des dominicains, comme les Pères Concanen, Harold, Connolly. La nomination de ce dernier à l'évêché de New York ne pouvait être plus malheureuse: l'Angleterre et les Etats-Unis étaient alors en guerre, et en envoyait un sujet anglais pour gouverneur un diocèse américain! Ce déplorable état ne dura que trop longtemps et l'histoire de ces intrigues irlandaises se retrouve encore en 1819 et 1820. Mgr. Connolly n'arriva à New York qu'en décembre 1815, et, comme on peut facilement le supposer, il ne fut reçu avec enthousiasme, et son administration ne fut pas heureuse."

⁷⁷Hughes, "Hist. of the Society of Jesus etc.," Documents, vol. I, pt. II, p. 945.

⁷⁸*Op. cit.*, vol. III, p. 665.

discussion. Dr. Connolly's election was solely the action of the Holy See, and was a reward—if such a promotion from the peace of the cloister to the turbulent conditions of New York can justly be so called—for his services to the Holy See during many long years, especially during the time when the ecclesiastical institutions of Rome were at the mercy of the French. The action of the Holy See in sending an alien subject to America might, indeed, have proved unfortunate; but Bishop Connolly soon allayed any fears on that score.⁷⁹ Trouble arose and arose quickly on all sides, however, and if a judgment on his episcopate must be made, it must be made with a full knowledge of the conditions he found in his diocese on his arrival.

Bishop Connolly's experience in the score of years he had acted as agent of the Irish bishops was joined to sound theological and canonical learning. Of his zeal nothing but praise has been written. Bayley, in his "History of the Catholic Church on the Island of New York," tells us that "in his new diocese, everything was to be created; and whilst the resources were very small, the obstacles in his way were very great. The trustee system had not been behind its early promise, and trustees of churches had become so accustomed to have everything their own way, that they were not disposed to allow even the interference of a bishop. Bishop Connolly was not lacking in firmness, but the great wants of his new diocese made it necessary for him to fall in, to a certain extent, with the established order of things and thus exposed him afterwards to much difficulty and many humiliations."⁸⁰

Truly, the *dramatis personae* of the New York trustee trouble

⁷⁹In Cobbett's "Letters to George IV," there is a reference to Dr. Connolly: "In the city of New York, there are, perhaps, thousands of cars and of car-horses, a vast proportion of which are owned by Irishmen. Irishmen load and unload the ships; they have churches in that city, to which there were, when I came from that country, fifteen thousand communicants belonging; a fact which I had from the Catholic Bishop himself, who had a few weeks before arrived from Rome, without exciting any alarm in the government of the state, and without anybody pestering him with the subject of a 'veto'. So that there cannot be a Catholic population in New York of less than about twenty thousand souls, forming about a sixth part of the whole of the population of the city; while the English church, though most richly endowed, from the time of the royal government, cannot, I think, boast of a third part of that number" (Cited in the *Miscellany*, vol. III, p. 408).

⁸⁰Page 65.

which began to take an organized shape about the beginning of 1816, were a singular group. The priests who took sides in the quarrel were all men of excellent education and of cosmopolitan training. The laymen were among the leaders of society in the city, rich for the most part, and prominent in the affairs of the State and nation. Andrew Morris, whom we have already mentioned as the host to Bishop Plessis, and who is so charmingly pictured by the Quebec prelate, was one of those successful merchants with whom we are familiar in the early history of New York. Dominick Lynch was a wealthy landowner and merchant and was one of the four national signers of the Address from the Roman Catholics to Washington in 1790. Lewis Willcocks, the son-in-law of Morris, will have a large share in the fight, and these gentlemen will be joined by Thomas Stoughton, who was the Consul for Spain in the city; his son, James Stoughton, a lawyer; the Count de Spainville, the French Consul; Cornelius Heeney, the philanthropist; Dennis McCarthy; Charles MacReady, and many others whom Plessis will group together in the expressive phrase—*la canaille irlandaise*.

The most remarkable priest at the time in New York was Peter Malou, then a member of the Society of Jesus. John Talbot Smith, who claims that Malou had "a consistent, holy and remarkable career," thus pictures the former Belgian general: "Peter Anthony Malou was at this time a man of sixty years, a Belgian by birth, who had filled high positions in his native land at a critical period of its history. Wealthy, married, and a popular leader, he had first opposed the attempts of the Austrian, Joseph II, to destroy the Church, and then the designs of the French Republic on the liberty of Belgium. In the struggle of the time he held the rank of general in the Belgian army, was compelled to fly before the Terror, and took refuge in America. In the meantime his wife died, and when he went back to Europe his thoughts turned to the cloister, he entered the Jesuit Society, and was ordained priest. In the course of time he found himself teaching in the Literary Institute of New York. In later days his son became a senator of Belgium, and his grandson Bishop of Bruges. . . . He remained assistant at St. Peter's for many years, became entangled in the trustee troubles and was suspended by Bishop Connolly, withdrew from the Jesuit Society and lived in

retirement in the city, was restored to his old position by Father Power, and died in 1826."⁸¹ Much more than this paragraph of praise will need to be written about Father Peter Malou.

The young Father O'Gorman, whom Dr. Connolly will later urge upon the Holy See as his coadjutor, apparently was kept out of the *melée*, owing to the fact that his missionary life was spent in Albany, Utica, Auburn, and other places. He died November 18, 1824, a week before the death of Father Peter Bulger, the first priest to be ordained in New York by Bishop Connolly. Father Thomas Carbry, O. P., one of the four priests in New York when Bishop Connolly arrived, was an assistant at St. Patrick's from May 5, 1816, until April 30, 1819, when he suddenly quitted his New York assignment to assume the leadership of the Norfolk schism. Two other names must now be mentioned—those of Father Charles Dominic Ffrench, O. P., and Father William Taylor. In the final line-up in 1817, the two parties, that of the Bishop and that of the trustees, will have as partisans the following: on the one side with Bishop Connolly will be the two Dominicans, Carbry and Ffrench, and on the other with the trustees will be Malou and Taylor. Father Carbry figures less in the New York troubles than any of the priests we have mentioned.

On March 8, 1816, Bishop Connolly wrote to Father William Vincent Harold, O. P., thanking Harold and Father John Ryan, O. P., for the kind attention paid to him during his stay in Dublin. The trustees of St. Mary's Church, Philadelphia, had written to Bishop Connolly shortly after his arrival, praying him "to obtain your [Harold's] restoration in that city *in any capacity compatible with the views of the Holy See*." Bishop Connolly declined to intervene in the matter, because he believed that the See of Philadelphia was then filled. Since then others had been influential in Harold's behalf. "Your friends of Philadelphia," he writes, "are not the only persons desirous of your return to this country, for Messrs. Stoughton and McCarthy, who are now trustees at New York, waited upon me lately in the name of the other trustees, praying me to request of you in their name, to come to exercise your known zeal and abilities again at New York, where you are still admired as an eminent preacher. . . . Per-

⁸¹"The Catholic Church in New York," vol. I, pp. 57-58. New York, 1905.

mit me then to join my wishes and entreaties to those of said Gentlemen who are so desirous to have you here."⁸² Father Harold did not accept this invitation to New York, but came later (December, 1821) on the invitation of the Philadelphia trustees. His part in the trustee struggle in that city has already been described.

Bishop Connolly was considering the advisability of sending to Ireland for two other priests, John England of Cork and William Taylor of Cloyne.⁸³ Father Taylor was to become the centre of all the opposition to Bishop Connolly, until the latter's death. Taylor had been a Protestant, was a graduate of Trinity College, and of well-known Irish family. Bishop Connolly wrote to Taylor in June, 1817, inviting him to come to America.⁸⁴

Some time after the receipt of this letter, Father Taylor came to New York.⁸⁵ John England had decided about this time to accept the parish of Bandon, and no doubt he wrote to that effect to Dr. Connolly. The Sacred Congregation informed Bishop Connolly on September 20, 1817, that since he had gone from Rome, no correspondence from his hand had reached Propaganda. The Cardinal-Prefect advised him to begin the formation of a native clergy by the erection of a Seminary for that purpose. Meanwhile Dr. Connolly would do well to secure priests from Ireland. A Report on the Diocese of New York was eagerly awaited in Rome.⁸⁶

Another newcomer at this time to the Diocese was the Dominican Father Charles Dominic Ffrench, whose loyalty to Bishop Connolly during these troublesome years earned for him the bitter and violent enmity of the trustee faction. Father Ffrench had failed in an attempt to establish a house of his Order in New Brunswick, and then offered his services to the Bishop of Boston. While in charge of the congregation at Claremont, New

⁸²Original in Dominican Archives at Tallaght. Copy in Prop. Arch., *Atti* (1821), ff. 176-177. Cf. Kirlin, *op. cit.*, p. 232

⁸³Cf. Bayley, *op. cit.*, p. 69.

⁸⁴Prop. Arch., "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 5, fol. 98.

⁸⁵In his "Register of the Clergy laboring in New York" (*Historical Records and Studies*, vol. I, p. 215). Archbishop Corrigan states that Father Taylor came in June, 1818. It was through Taylor's services that John England's friend, Father John Power, of Cork, was induced to come to New York. Corrigan calls Taylor "an early example of Americanism."

⁸⁶Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 298, fol. 546.

Hampshire, he made the acquaintance of the Barber family and was instrumental in bringing them into the Catholic Church. Bishop Connolly invited him to come to New York, and after his arrival in January, 1818, appointed him assistant at the Cathedral.⁸⁷ No priest in the history of the New York Diocese was so bitterly vilified by trustee adherents, cleric and lay. And, since we shall see some of this unfortunate correspondence, it may be well at the outset to state the case in favor of Father Ffrench from contemporary sources. In the "Memoranda of the Diocese of Boston," begun by Bishop Fenwick, S. J., in 1825, and continued by Bishop Fitzpatrick to 1861, there is a paragraph regarding Father Ffrench which should be cited. In these memoirs, Bishops Fenwick speaks very frankly about all the priests who labored in the Boston missions and he spared none who deserve the slightest criticism. Yet, in every line about Father Ffrench, there stands out from the page the priest of exemplary conduct and apostolic zeal. Bishop Fitzpatrick's high opinion of Father Ffrench is contained in a beautiful tribute on the occasion of Ffrench's death. After speaking of him in affectionate terms for his priestly qualities, Bishop Fenwick says:

He erected several churches during his time. In this diocese the Church of Portland, East Portland, Dover, and the first small church in Lawrence were built by him. He was a man of great bodily beauty and magnificent bodily appearance, tall and although weighing 250 pounds, not disproportioned in any way nor unwieldly. In the ministry he was remarkable for his zeal, energy, and enterprise, and the piety of his conduct and regularity of life. His manners were most amiable and winning, his temper even and placid, his spirit buoyant and sprightly though seasoned with becoming gravity. Perhaps the most remarkable of his virtues was the charity which regulated at all times his conversation. He was never heard to speak ill of any person, and the ingenuity with which he would endeavor to present in some favourable light the faults even of his enemies was at times as amusing as it was edifying. During the last two years of his life he was disabled by a dropsical affection seated principally in the legs, from the discharge of the active duties of the ministry. He had not been able to say Mass for several months previous to his death."

⁸⁷Corrigan, *ut supra*, vol. II, p. 40.

No one knew better than Bishop Fenwick of Boston the inner history of the New York quarrel, and it is safe to conclude that had there been the least cause for adverse criticism, it would have found its way into the "Memoranda."

These, then, are the principal characters in the grave quarrel which arose between the trustees and the Bishop of New York.

The two churches in the city of New York, St. Peter's and St. Patrick's, formed a financial unit governed by a single board of trustees. Soon after Bishop Connolly's arrival, it became evident that the board either was unwilling or unable to place these two churches on a secure financial standing; in fact both became so poor that neither the bishop nor the clergy could be given the salaries agreed upon. In consequence, Bishop Connolly dissolved the single board of trustees, incorporated the two churches separately (April 11, 14, 1817), and secured control of the Cathedral by having a board elected loyal to himself.⁸⁹ He then attempted to gain control of St. Peter's by a similar election, and this precipitated the quarrel which disturbed the Church of New York until the time of Archbishop Hughes. The factions were, as has been already stated, that of the bishop with his two fellow-Dominicans, Fathers Carbry and Ffrench, and that of the trustees, with Fathers Malou and Taylor. The subsequent meetings of the trustees became very stormy. At the election held in March, 1818, four policemen were summoned to preserve order.

Bishop Connolly intervened in the Charleston trouble not long after. In a letter to Archbishop Neale (November 6, 1816), he interceded in behalf of Dr. Gallagher, who had written to him to say that he was in deep distress over his recent suspension; and the Archbishop of Baltimore accepted Dr. Connolly's offer of mediation, although he considered it useless.⁹⁰ In spite of his failure to rescue Dr. Gallagher from the consequences of his own failings, Bishop Connolly intervened again, the following year by letters both to Archbishop Maréchal and to Propaganda in favor of Father Carbry's candidacy to the new See which he believed should be erected at Norfolk. All in all, it would appear, although there is no specific document to support the theory, that

⁸⁹Farley, "History of St. Patrick's Cathedral," p. 75. New York, 1908.

⁹⁰BCA, Case 12-M5.

Propaganda had imposed upon him the duty of informing the Holy See of the true condition of ecclesiastical affairs in all the dioceses of the United States. Even in a short letter (February 25-26, 1818)—the first in fact which seems to have reached the Sacred Congregation—he gives a brief survey of conditions from Boston to Charleston; and when Propaganda replied (July 25, 1818), the answer is also written from the national standpoint. Certainly, of all the members of the American hierarchy, none was so capable of giving to the Holy See accurate information on ecclesiastical affairs here.

The storm which broke in the New York Church about the end of the year 1817 was a severe one while it lasted, and none of the participants came out unscathed. Father Malou's attack upon the Bishop brought counter-attacks, especially from Father Ffrench; and as early as April 20, 1818, a long document of twenty-six pages was forwarded to Archbishop Maréchal in Malou's vindication.⁹¹ Bishop Cheverus, who was watching the amassing of the forces of order and disorder south of Boston with his usual aloofness, suggested to Maréchal (June 25, 1818) that the only hope for peace lay in the appointment of an Apostolic Delegate.⁹² If it were any solace to him, Maréchal might have taken courage from the fact that Archbishop Troy of Dublin had written in his usual frank way (July 31, 1818) that he was greatly "concerned that the misconduct of my clerical countrymen should give scandal" in the American Church.⁹³ It was about this time that the priests and laity who were abetting the rebellion of the trustees from New York to Charleston, were plotting the Independent Catholic Church of America.

The conferring of the pallium on Archbishop Maréchal did not take place until December 19, 1819; and until that time, the Metropolitan of Baltimore was unable canonically to deal with any of the questions referred to him from the other dioceses of the country. Before this ceremony had occurred, the quarrel in New York had become a violent feud between Father Malou, S. J., and Father Charles Ffrench, O. P. Malou's letters to Archbishop Maréchal and especially to Bishop Plessis of Quebec are filled

⁹¹BCA, Case 22-F1.

⁹²BCA, Case 14-124.

⁹³BCA, Case 20-Y2.

with bitter diatribe, innuendo, and finally open charges of misconduct against Ffrench, whom he calls "the sworn enemy of all the French priests, especially bishops and Jesuits."⁹⁴ Lewis Willcocks, who belonged to the Malou faction, denounced Father Ffrench in one of the meetings of the trustees of St. Peter's, and the Dominican instituted a suit against him for defamation of character. Willcocks found it necessary to secure legal proofs of his charge that Father Ffrench would "do more injury to the Catholic religion in this State than ten good priests may be able to retrieve in ten years." Bishop Connolly refused to listen to these charges, and while Lewis Willcocks started for St. John's, New Brunswick, to collect criminal evidence against Ffrench, the trustees of St. Peter's drew up a "Memorial" against Bishop Connolly. The document (40 pp.) is in the Baltimore Cathedral Archives, and is too characteristic of the malign spirit of such papers to be cited.⁹⁵ The trustees decided to appeal to Archbishop Maréchal to intervene in the quarrel. In declining to accept the appeal, Maréchal urged upon the Bishop of New York in a kindly way to try to effect peace between the two factions. This is Dr. Connolly's answer (December 30, 1819):

Most Revd. Sir:

I return your Grace my most sincere thanks for your kind and friendly letter of the 24th inst. But am exceedingly sorry that it is not in my power at this moment to do or suggest anything likely to quiet the minds of the two contending parties here, whereas the major part of the trustees of our church of Saint Peter labour to deprive me of my spiritual rights, while the major part of the trustees of our cathedral, and the mass of our numerous congregation are intent on supporting me in the enjoyment of them. The former have, especially since the beginning of this year, insisted that it is their right, as trustees, not only to provide priests for Saint Peter's church, but also to dismiss them when they please. The latter acknowledge that affairs of this nature belong exclusively to me. The former insisted in a peremptory manner that I would immediately dismiss Rev. Fr. Ffrench from both said churches. The latter respectfully prayed me that I would not dismiss him. The former threatened me to shut their church door against him. I answered that if I did,

⁹⁴Cited by Zwierlein, "Les Nomminations épiscopales etc., p. 534.

⁹⁵BCA, Case 22-B2.

they should have no priest in that church. They deprived him of his salary; it was immediately paid him by the trustees of the cathedral. One of the trustees of Saint Peter's church threatened me that my annual pension might perhaps be withdrawn from me by his colleagues of Saint Peter's church. The mass of our congregation deputed three persons of their body to know if that was true. I answered that it was; but being only an hasty menace, no notice ought to be taken of it.

I forbear giving your Grace any further instances of their improper conduct towards me, except that after preferring their charges against Mr. French to me, they pretended to have a right to dictate to me the manner I should proceed in examining this matter, and the time within which I should communicate to them my decision on it. At length finding they were in the wrong in said proceedings, they required me to form an ecclesiastical Court to examine that business; and because I did not immediately execute their suggested plan, they, in my presence and against my will, resolved to recur to your Grace for your decision on it, although it lay still before me *in prima instantia*.

Seeing therefore the disposition of their minds, I am persuaded that our disagreements will continue untill next Easter Monday on which three of the trustees of Saint Peter's church are to go out of office and will be succeeded by three new trustees to be chosen by the congregation that day. As I hope that these three new trustees will be men of moderation, I flatter myself that our troubles will then finish, in case Father Malou be called away by the Revd. Fr. Kohlmann, who indeed called him away from this diocese last May; but requested at the same time that he would be permitted to stay here until he would be able to travel to Georgetown, as he had broken the cap of his knee some months before. All this was granted him with the continuation of his pension; yet he continues still here, tho' well able to travel.

Those are my sentiments, being perfectly persuaded that peace and tranquillity can not [be] established here, but by the ensuing election of six new trustees next March; whereas I think that any decision that would be given before that time, in favour of either contending parties, would greatly exasperate the other. I could say more on this business, but I think it superfluous at this moment. I therefore conclude, assuring your Grace, that I am with sincere esteem and profound veneration, Most Revd. Sir,

Your most obedt. and humble Servt.,

✠JOHN CONNOLLY,

*Bishop, New York.*⁹⁶

⁹⁶Cited by Zwierlein, *ut supra*, pp. 537-538.

The trustees, fearing that Father Ffrench would succeed in carrying the election of the board in favor of Bishop Connolly, decided to send an envoy to Rome to plead their case. Their choice was Father William Taylor, whom Malou had already proposed to Maréchal as the proper subject to be named coadjutor-Bishop of New York (October 18, 1818).⁹⁷ Propaganda had not been idle. So many conflicting reports had come from New York, Philadelphia, Norfolk and Charleston, that the only safe measure to take was to send some one to analyze the situation thoroughly. Bishop Plessis was then in Rome, and Cardinal Fontana asked him to visit the United States in the capacity of an Apostolic Delegate and to send to Rome a complete Report on the state of ecclesiastical affairs in the American dioceses. This mission Plessis fulfilled; and on September 6, 1820, he wrote a short letter to Fontana containing the principal points of a Report. He had reached New York on July 21, 1820, and had studied thoroughly, as he believed, the condition of things in that city, in Philadelphia, and in Baltimore.

The "Pastoral Letter to the Roman Catholics of Norfolk" (September 28, 1819), which Maréchal had "published against the Irish Dominican Carbry had had its effect, in this sense that this schismatic is almost totally abandoned and despised as he merits." Maréchal, however, was hoping that the Holy See would erect the Diocese of the two Carolinas and Georgia and would name Father Benedict Fenwick, S. J., to the new See. Dr. De Barth was wisely administering the Diocese of Philadelphia.

"At New York, Monsignor Connolly, a man noted for his knowledge and for the many virtues worthy of the episcopate, after having been for a long time blinded by Father Carbry, is now being led by another Irish Dominican, named Charles Ffrench, employed in the missions of my diocese from 1813 to 1817, when I deprived him of his faculties. . . . The bishop who had taken him in with good faith and had given him his confidence, continued to show preference for him, in spite of the information which the saner element of his priests offered, and is assured that he has the support of the majority of his people in so doing. But this majority is composed of the Irish rabble

⁹⁷BCA, Case 18-08.

(*la canaille irlandaise*) which Father Ffrench knows so well how to arouse and to lead. It is an ignorant and savage lot, always ready to take the part of anyone who flatters it. The respectable Catholics of this city, driven to extremes by so much credulity on the one hand and by so much wickedness on the other, confuse the bishop with his favourite, speak of the bishop with very little respect, and finally separate themselves from him, thus giving scandal to the Protestants."

Plessis then urges that the Sacred Congregation order the immediate removal from New York of the two leaders—Ffrench and Malou.⁹⁸ Maréchal was pleased with Plessis's view of the situation. But on January 6, 1821, he sent to the Quebec prelate the "sorrowful news" of the nominations to the Sees of Philadelphia, Charleston and Richmond. "La lettre," he writes, "que votre bonté pour moi et votre zèle pour la religion vous ont porté à écrire à Rome est arrivée malheureusement trop tard. *Je n'ai que des nouvelles disastreuses à vous donner.* La Propagande a rejeté les missionnaires éprouvés que moi et mes suffragants lui avaient recommandés. *Elle leur a préféré des prêtres irlandais.* Elle a nommé Dr. Conwell évêque de Philadelphie, Dr. England évêque de Charleston, et enfin Dr. Kelly évêque de Richmond."⁹⁹

It would seem that the only part of Plessis's message which Propaganda decided to heed was the removal of both Father Ffrench and Father Malou from New York. That this would seem to be the prudent thing to do is borne out by the reflexion of the French Minister, De Neuville, to Maréchal (October 14, 1819)—"Je vois d'un côté Scandale, de l'autre je ne puis m'empêcher de voir insubordination ou au moins oubli de subordination."¹⁰⁰ De Neuville bids him remember his great patron Ambrose of Milan! Thomas Stoughton, the Spanish Consul, wrote to Maréchal on December 4, 1819, informing him that the trustees were going to send a Memorial to Rome, and expressed his exceeding regret that Maréchal's jurisdiction did not extend over New York.¹⁰¹

By December, 1819, Father Taylor had accepted the mission to

⁹⁸Têtu, "*Journal etc.*," pp. 43-432.

⁹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 433.

¹⁰⁰BCA, Case 19-Q6.

¹⁰¹BCA, Case 20-P6.

Rome in behalf of the Trustees. "I have been requested," he writes to Maréchal under the injunction of profound secrecy, "by a number of the most respectable members of the Congregation to undertake a journey to Rome and to lay before the Holy Father a statement of the lamentable and prostrate condition of the Catholic Religion in this city and at the same time to supplicate his Holiness to empower Your Grace or the Archbishop of Quebec to connect the *effect* with the *cause* and apply the proper remedy." He was desirous of having Maréchal's advice and consent: "I should feel happy to be instrumental in terminating the scandals and dissensions here which have almost *extinguished* the faith here." He had, he confesses, no respect for Bishop Connolly because of the latter's protection of Father Ffrench.¹⁰²

Archbishop Maréchal approved the journey to Rome, as is evident from the following letter, written by Taylor on December 20, 1819:

My Lord.

I have received your letter and feel happy at your having approved of my intended Mission to Rome. The Respectable Individuals who made the proposition to me have arranged matters for my immediate departure and, in the event of no direct opportunity presenting itself, I shall probably embark for "Havre" and travel through France. I shall ask no character of Dr. Connolly and shall depend on the letter I receive from you. You may depend on my faithfully executing your commands and giving by letter and I hope *viva voce* a particular account of my statement and success.

I know well many will *industriously* say that I have gone to accuse a venerable Bishop. But God knows I am actuated by no motive but that of preventing dismal consequences to our Holy Religion.

I go not to accuse any man; I go to *state facts* and if the administration of a Bishop is, by *implication*, brought into question, I am not responsible, for the accuracy of my statement to the Holy See, I pledge my character which is dearer to me than life. And as my way of acting may render my future residence under Dr. Connolly undesirable and unpleasant, I may seek an Asylum in the Diocese of Your Grace or that of my friend Dr. DeBarth. However, this will be determined on my return and by the result of the investigation

¹⁰²BCA, Case 20-R5.

which will, I am confident, take place. I hope to be back in five months or probably sooner.

Your Grace will prepare your letters instantly and forward them to Mr. Larue for me. You may probably give me a letter to the Superior of the Sulpicians in Paris. Let no time be lost as the moment I receive your packet I shall depart. I have addressed Rev. Mr. Kohlmann and His Excellency Mr. Neuville and am anxious that my intended departure may still be kept secret and that the object of my Mission may only be made known by its result. Recommending myself to a particular notice in your Sacrifices and prayers, I remain, *Your Grace's faithful Servant,*

WM. TAYLOR.¹⁰³

Maréchal in reply approved the sentiments of Taylor's letter but advised him to inform Bishop Connolly of the whole affair before leaving. Moreover, as the Archbishop pointed out to Taylor, his mission was a very delicate one, since the Holy See would never "condemn a prelate or priest without dispassionately considering the principles upon which he may found his justification or ground for defence."¹⁰⁴ This gave Taylor pause; for, in his first letter of December 28, 1819, to Maréchal, he hesitates over the question whether his journey to Rome was advisable in the circumstances. Before the day was over, he sent the following letter to the Archbishop, marked "private":

My Lord:

I addressed a hasty letter to your Grace, by the post of this morning, and a subsequent conversation I had with Doctor Connolly obliges me to intrude a moment on your time. I beg leave to premise to your Grace that the object of my intended journey to Rome was, as a clergyman attached to this church, to lay before the Sacred College in the Latin language a statement of the unfortunate differences and scandals which agitate and divide our congregation here. I was not to be the bearer of dispatches from any portion of the Laity against my Bishop. I would never act in such a capacity. The Laity merely enabled me to meet the unavoidable expenses, attendant on such a journey and I would in my statement request that Your Grace may be appointed judge (or the Archbishop of Quebec on the occasion). I intended to be present at the investigation myself. I know and am persuaded of the caution and vigilance acted on at Rome.

¹⁰³BCA, Case 20-R6.

¹⁰⁴BCA, Case 20-R27.

Nor did I ever wish or expect to see or hear of any man being condemned without an impartial hearing in his own defence.

I, however, in compliance with your request this morning, at breakfast informed Dr. Connolly of the proposition made to me and added that I should feel happy to be the bearer of his letters, etc. He remarked that he was not astonished at the proposal made to me and said he would address a letter to Rome by Post in his own defence. He said he was convinced I would, if I undertook the journey, tell the truth and that I might by a fair statement render him especial service. Your *name* was not *mentioned* in his conversation—nor at all.

I addressed letters to the Bishop of Boston, Mr. DeBarth and Mr. Kohlmann and His Excellency Mr. Neuville, requesting letters of introduction to Paris and Rome; I have received answers from these gentlemen with the exception of Dr. Cheverus whose answer I could not as yet have received, immediately complying with my request. I shall, if you disapprove of my immediate departure, return these letters and continue to do my duty here. I shall feel most happy if you will amicably terminate our differences and render unnecessarily a voyage from which I had nothing to expect but trouble, anxiety and fatigue. Should you, however, be inclined to suppose that my journey may be of utility and that I should do good, send instantly your packet to the French Consul, Reed Street, New York, and address myself by the returning Post. I am, with veneration and respect,

Your Grace's faithful servant,

WILLIAM TAYLOR.

I hope you will deem my departure unnecessary. If I am to go the sooner the better, if not, I shall return the letters and be a mere passive spectator of our troubles in the future. I shall, in silence, deplore their continuance and will be responsible only for my own conduct.¹⁰⁵

Meanwhile the Archbishop wrote to Bishop Connolly, urging him to bring peace between the two factions, in order to make Taylor's journey unnecessary.¹⁰⁶ On December 30, 1819, Bishop Connolly replied in the letter given above, across the back of which Maréchal has written: "Waits for a new election of Trustees as the sole means of peace."

¹⁰⁵BCA, Case 20-R8.

¹⁰⁶BCA, Case 19-T5.

It is not certain when Taylor made up his mind definitely to go to Rome; but evidently it must have been about this time, because Maréchal in a letter (December 31, 1819) to Father John Grassi, S. J., then in Rome, says that Father Taylor will bring a letter containing information for Propaganda regarding the See of Virginia, which cannot be placed at Washington, D. C. "Vous me feriez bien de plaisir," he writes, "et ce seroit rendre un grand service à la religion, de Prêter votre carte des Etats-Unis au Card. Fontana."¹⁰⁷

We have an echo of the meeting of the Board of Trustees in New York (February 21, 1820) in a letter from Father Power to Maréchal, dated March 2, 1820. The quarrel had now reached a stage which defied intervention, for anything he could say "of that meeting would not give you even a faint idea of what it was, as it really baffles all description."¹⁰⁸ Charity would suggest that the letter be allowed to remain in the obscurity of the archives, but justice to both sides of the quarrel requires at least one quotation. Father Power had preached that Sunday morning at St. Peter's on death, and he mentioned that the thought of death should regulate the friendships we would wish to form and the animosities we may be inclined to entertain. He then alluded to the report circulated through the congregation regarding the object of Taylor's visit to Rome—that "he went to Rome to tear the mitre off Dr. Connolly's head or to have himself promoted to the Coadjutorship of this See," and he begged the charity of their silence until Taylor's return. "The moment I left the pulpit, Mr. Ffrench, then the celebrant, addressed the people in a harangue more like the revery of a madman than an exhortation falling from the lips of a minister of the God of peace . . . having thus expressed himself and in a fury that would horrify the stoutest heart . . . he ran to the Altar and in all the impetuosity of passion offered up the holy Sacrifice, to the great scandal and horror of the Congregation. Yet, my Lord, I am censured by Doctor Connolly and his party for my exertions in endeavouring to restore peace and harmony and Mr. Ffrench after all the public disedification he has given is lauded by his Bishop who 'is indeed surprised that he was so moderate.' We are at present dreadfully

¹⁰⁷Cited in Hughes, *op. cit.*, "Documents," vol. I, pt. II, p. 914.

¹⁰⁸BCA, Case 19-Y5.

convulsed. If you could prevail upon yourself to interfere, I am convinced that such interference would have a salutary effect and would confer an everlasting favour on the thinking portion of the congregation."

Father Taylor reached Genoa on March 1, after a tedious journey from Paris, where he had been hospitably received by the Archbishop and the Papal Nuncio. He met Plessis at Lyons, then on his way back to Quebec. "From my conversation with the Bishop of Quebec," Taylor writes to Archbishop Maréchal (Genoa, March 2, 1820), "I could infer that some unprincipled person has industriously misrepresented the state of the Catholic Religion in America and has given an unfavourable description of the French Bishops and Clergy in that Country at the Court of Rome. Cardinal Fontana told the Bishop of Quebec that the people did not like to have French Bishops in that country. I shall, you may depend on it, connect this unblushing calumny with its source and give it a complete refutation before my departure from Rome."¹⁰⁹ At Paris, he had seen a letter from Archbishop Troy to a priest of that city, announcing Dr. Conwell's nomination to Philadelphia. This is one of the few letters Maréchal has marked *important*. Taylor's presence in Rome is first mentioned in a letter (April 20, 1820) from Propaganda to Cardinal Consalvi, Secretary of State, stating that the material on the New York dissensions is so large that much time will be needed to translate it from English and to study it.¹¹⁰ Taylor did his work well in Rome. Despite his avowal that he had no intention to strike at Dr. Connolly, he names as the second cause of all the disorder in New York—*ex antistitis mentis et judicii imbecillitate*.¹¹¹ On June 20, 1820, Propaganda asked for speed in the translation of the summary of the New York documents, since Taylor was soon to leave for America. The progress of his mission is described in a letter to Archbishop Maréchal, dated Rome, July 8, 1820:

My Lord,

I have addressed two letters to your Grace, one from

¹⁰⁹BCA, Case 20-R9.

¹¹⁰Prop. Arch., "Lettere," vol. 301, fol. 380.

¹¹¹Taylor to Propaganda, June 6, 1820—*ibid.*, "Scritt. rifer., Amer. Cent.," vol. 4, no. 156.

Genoa and another from this city, which I hope you have regularly received. Since my arrival here I have composed a short statement of the causes which agitate the congregation of New York. It has been translated into Italian by the good Father Grassy and given to the Sacred Congregation accompanied with the documents necessary to establish the truth of its contents. It has been circulated among the Cardinals and will soon become the subject of discussion in a general Consistory. They seem to be convinced of the two following facts: Dr. Connolly's mental imbecility and incapacity to govern; Ffrench's depraved morals and scandalous conduct. What remedy they may deem proper to adopt, God only knows, and I await with painful anxiety to ascertain. I have at least done my duty. Dr. Connolly has written two long letters in which he describes his favorite Ffrench as a Confessor and all those who call for an investigation into the character of that unfortunate man, as the enemies of Religion. C. Litta, a few days before his death, regretted in his conversation with me, that he had ever been instrumental in Dr. Connolly's promotion. Card. Fontana, Pietro, and Somaglia did not conceal from me their sentiments on the subject. I am however obliged to inform your Grace that the Holy See is much deceived as to the real state of the Catholic Religion in America. Some *evil spirits* have been unfortunately successful in persuading the Crd. Fontana and others that the French Bishops are remarkable for the tyrannical exercise of their jurisdiction: that they have formed a "league" with the Jesuits to exclude Irish Priests from their mission and that they are in general disliked in the United States. In my exposition I attempted to refute this calumny in a manner which you will not dislike. I said there never was a more respectable Bench (with the exception of Dr. Connolly) of Bishops than the American, that they commanded universal respect and esteem and that so far from excluding any good clergyman, they received them with open arms. I added that Ireland like other countries had good and bad clergymen, that with some few exceptions, the Irish Priests going to the United States were men who forfeited their character in their own Country, and who, unfortunately for Religion did not "put on the new man," approaching the new world; that the bad conduct of some and the apostacy of others rendered caution and circumspection absolutely necessary.

I however could not obtain credence in this respect for my statement. I did what I could to forward your recommendation of Mr. Fenwick and Rev. Mr. Gallitizin, but am in-

formed this day that the congregation have appointed a Mr. England to the See of Charleston and have detached Virginia from your Grace's jurisdiction and appointed Mr. Kelly Bishop of Richmond. Of the geography of the United States they are very ignorant here. Card. Fontana whose judgment is much and seriously affected by years, told me it was their intention to erect Virginia into a Bishop-rick and to have the Bishop reside at Hartford. I told his Eminence that Hartford was in Connecticut, that Richmond was considered the Capital of Virginia, and it was only by producing the map of America that I convinced his Eminence of this *geographical heresy*. I could not describe to your Grace the censurable and unchristian conduct of Irish Friars here: they have attempted even to protect the unprincipled Carbery, who has been invited to Rome to render an account of his conduct. Dr. Connolly has arrayed his brother Dominicans against me and they are at work to defeat the object of my mission. However, I hope, truth will defend itself. I am apprehensive the Underagents of the Propaganda will soon, by their own judicious proceedings, detach entire countries from the Holy See. I have much to say to your Grace should God prolong my life until I have an interview with you. Recommending myself to your sacrifices and prayers, I am, with unalterable veneration and respect,

Yr. faithful servt.

WILLIAM TAYLOR.¹¹²

Taylor left Rome about the beginning of August, 1820, and was exhorted by the Sacred Congregation to wait in Ireland for the decision of Propaganda on the New York dissensions. No decision had been reached by the end of the year 1820, as Propaganda informed Taylor who was then in Paris, on December 23, 1820. There was nothing left to him to do but to return to New York and there await the decision of the Sacred Congregation.

He arrived in New York on February 1, 1821, and the following day informed Archbishop Maréchal that he had been refused faculties in the diocese by Bishop Connolly:

My Lord,

I hasten to inform your Grace of my arrival in this city after a tedious passage of 88 days. After a residence of 5 months in Rome it was *officially* determined that the state of the church of New York should become the subject of discussion in a general Congregation, in the month of Novem-

¹¹²BCA, Case 20-R10.

ber last past and that the final sentence should be transmitted to your Grace. My memorial and its appended documents were printed and circulated amongst the Cardinals who are members of the Propaganda. I have some hopes that decision will be favourable to the reestablishment of order and peace. As I was given to understand that I would not be the bearer of the answer I expressed a determination to Cardinal della Somaglia of returning to New York and requested of his Eminence to protect me by the Canons of the Church until the arrival of the definite answer of the Congregation. He gave me [a] . . . letter which I yesterday handed Dr. Connolly in company with my friend Revd. Mr. Power.

Dr. Connolly without assigning any admissible reasons has thought proper to prevent me from the exercise (to use his own expression) "*of any priestly functions*," I shall not be compelled to act imprudently nor shall I resort to the press for my justification at least immediately, but I call on your Grace as our Metropolitan to interfere and beg you may consider my application as a formal appeal from this sentence. I may, *pendente lite*, be induced to place myself under your guidance. I have much to say to you and much serious matter connected with yourself to communicate. You will be kind enough to write by the returning Post. The letters transmitted by Post were opened by the Authorities at Milan in my trunk.

Recommending myself to your Grace's sacrifices and prayers, I am with profound veneration, *Your faithful servant*,

WILLIAM TAYLOR.¹¹³

Further developments in Taylor's case are interesting. He saw that his usefulness in New York was finished, and applied to several of the bishops for a place in their dioceses. On February 15, 1821, he wrote to the Archbishop:

¹¹³BCA, Case 20-S11. The letter (August 19, 1820), from della Somaglia was as follows: "The Priest William Taylor having presented to this Sacred Congregation the request well known to Your Lordship, which shall be examined, in full Congregation, although exhorted to await in Ireland for the resolution, has nevertheless determined to return to America, and with this intent he has asked for a letter of recommendation directed to you. As he has, during all the time of his sojourn at Rome, shown prudent conduct, I cannot excuse myself from accompanying him with my offices of good will, and placing him under you benign reflections as you in the Lord shall judge most proper, and reserving for myself the charge of informing you of the determination which the Holy Congregation will come to, respecting the pending suit, I pray the Lord to preserve and prosper you."

My Lord,

I have received your Grace's letter and feel much obliged for your kind expressions relative to myself. I regret much that the dismemberment of your Diocese would not permit your Grace to employ, *pendente questione*, my services, that regret is however, considerably diminished by a letter which I have received from the truly good and amiable Bishop of Boston who kindly offers me an Asylum and employment until the expected answer arrives from Rome. To check the precipitancy of public opinion and to allay the popular ferment I felt myself obliged to publish the accompanying address and sincerely hope your Grace may not censure any expression as unguarded or indiscreet.

With respect to Dr. Connolly's way of acting, I merely beg leave to observe that previous to my departure from New York I had some canonical rights. I was invited from my own country by Dr. Connolly and still have his flattering letters in my possession. I don't imagine that my departure from New York has destroyed my rights or placed me in the situation of a person who tenders his services to a Bishop possessing consequently the liberty of receiving or expecting them at will. At least such was the opinion at Rome. I only now entreat of your Grace to state my case in your next letter to the Cardinal Prefect and recommend it to his consideration. I have done so myself to the Count de Blacus and to Cardinal Consalvi.

I had written to Dr. Flaget and to Dr. Plessis before I had received Dr. Cheverus' answer. I took the liberty of referring Dr. Flaget to your Grace for a statement of the motives which induced me to undertake this journey to Rome.

I have reasons for not applying to Bishop Conwell which shall be hereafter stated to your Grace. I am, with profound veneration and respect, *Your Grace's Hble Servt.*

WILLIAM TAYLOR¹¹⁴

In a general session of Propaganda in July, 1821, the bulky documents on the New York Church were placed before the Cardinals and officials of the Sacred Congregation by Cardinal Ercolani, the *Ponente* for the case.¹¹⁵ The letters and memorials taken up for consideration run from 1815 to the end of 1820. The Memorial to Pius VII by the Catholics of the city opposed

¹¹⁴BCA, Case 20-S12. In March, 1821, Taylor published several attacks upon Bishop Connolly, and these settled his ecclesiastical status in the diocese definitely.

¹¹⁵Prop. Arch., "Atti" (1821), ff. 275-345.

to Bishop Connolly, signed by Andrew Morris and James Stoughton, in the name of the trustees, contains a long series of complaints and accusations against Father Ffrench. The trustees ask for an Apostolic Delegate to be sent to New York to decide the justice of their cause, and they urge the necessity of the presence of such an official on account of the grave disorders in South Carolina and Virginia (*Esso guidicherebbe con una perfetta cognizione di causa sulle turbolenze eccitate nel Sud*). Father Malou added to the Memorial a postscript on the great good an Apostolic Legate would be to the Church at that time.

Then follows in the *Sommario* a number of letters from Father Taylor to the Cardinal-Prefect. These contain further accusations against Dr. Connolly and Father Ffrench. Taylor also suggested that an Apostolic Delegate, preferably Cheverus, be appointed to the United States. Maréchal's letters reiterate the plea that either Plessis or Cheverus be invested with the powers of a Nuncio. Plessis, Malou, Connolly, the New York clergy, and even Archbishop Troy of Dublin are represented in this large correspondence, which makes a pamphlet of forty-four pages in the original copy printed for the Cardinals, and the whole *dossier* reveals the almost unbelievable confusion which existed in New York at that time.

Behind the whole disorder was the imaginary phantom of French domination over the American Church.

Dr. Connolly's long letters to Propaganda (February 15, and March 10, 1820) describe the situation created by the two factions, and the Bishop of New York saw but one remedy—the exclusion of Malou and Taylor from the diocese. One of the most pathetic of these letters is that dated February 10, 1820, from the clergy of New York to Bishop Connolly, sustaining him in the fight he was making to overthrow the tyranny of the trustees, under whom the Church there had suffered for almost twenty-five years. Father Taylor's mission to Rome is interpreted by these priests as but a part of the general scheme to give the French clergy complete control of the Church in the United States. Taylor, they claim, is a Protestant in disguise, whose conversion to the Catholic Church was simulated for personal gain. They looked to Dr. Connolly "as to the protector and pillar of their religion in this vast diocese, since you are the only bishop

in the country who has confided the care of souls to those priests who can be understood by **all** the faithful."

Propaganda reached a decision at this general session, and on August 18, 1821, the following letter was sent to Bishop Connolly:

I can scarcely express to Your Lordship with what great sorrow their Eminences received the account of the grave dissensions and contentions which have so long and with great scandal to all agitated the Church there. Having maturely considered the statement made by both sides in the quarrel to the Sacred Congregation, no other remedy seems more apt and more certain to stop the growing evils than to remove the principal causes and seeds of the discord and trouble, namely Father Charles Ffrench, O. P., Father Malou, S. J., and William Taylor.

Wherefore, the Sacred Congregation expressly orders Your Lordship in its name to exhort Father Ffrench to leave the diocese for peace sake within three months from the receipt of this letter; should he refuse to obey this counsel, he is to be ordered to do so under pain of suspension, but without creating any scandal. To Father Malou you will give orders to leave the diocese at once, under pain of being deprived of all faculties, and of suspension *a divinis*. So far as Father Taylor is concerned, Your Lordship has already taken sufficient action.

The Sacred Congregation then urged Bishop Connolly to consider the advisability of having a coadjutor to assist him in the diocese.¹¹⁶

The significant part of the *Sommario* from which we have been quoting is a paragraph at the end, in which the Cardinals are practically told that great care must be used to prevent further ill-feeling on the part of the Irish clergy and laity in America against their French bishops. The recent appointment of three Irish priests (England, Kelly and Conwell) to three Sees in the United States would undoubtedly go far to allay the feeling that the Sacred Congregation was neglectful of this important consideration.

Taking advantage of Propaganda's wish to see the leaders of the New York troubles removed from the diocese, Connolly later recalled Father Malou's faculties and ordered him out of New

¹¹⁶*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 302, fol. 352.

York.¹¹⁷ Malou not only refused to go until he was informed of the charges against him, but appealed over Connolly's head to the Metropolitan of Baltimore. In reply to Maréchal's letter regarding the case, Dr. Connolly wrote (in French) on October 6, 1820, protesting that he had only conveyed to Malou the order of Father Kohlmann, Superior of the Jesuits, directing Father Malou to leave New York at once.¹¹⁸ Dr. Connolly wished him gone, however—"Je suis vraiment d'avis que la residence du Père Malou dans cette ville ne contribuera rien de tout à la paix de notre Congregation Catholique."¹¹⁹

Father Ffrench readily obeyed the decision of Propaganda, and applied to Plessis for a place in the Diocese of Quebec. It was a foregone conclusion that he would be refused. He went, however, in spite of the bitter reply he had received from Plessis, to St. John's, N. B., to search out his accusers, and while there published a little pamphlet in his own defence. For a time he had acted as a schoolmaster in the town, but finally returned to Boston, where he lived many years, loved by all, as we have seen, for his priestly zeal and self-sacrificing spirit.

New actors now appeared in the drama being enacted on the stage of the American Church.

On December 10, 1819, Taylor informed Maréchal that Father William Hogan had arrived in New York.¹²⁰ On December 30, 1820, Bishop John England reached Charleston. A month previous to this, Robert Browne reached New York with the news that both the Propaganda and Dr. England had reinstated him triumphant over Archbishop Maréchal. On November 27, 1820, Father Kohlmann, the Superior of the Jesuits, fearful that the Archbishop would feel that the "Irish" were closing in on him, wrote urging him not to protest against the three new bishops (Conwell, Kelly, England), lest the Irish of the United States should break out into open rebellion.¹²¹ Bishop Conwell reached Philadelphia on December 20, 1820. On December 29, 1820,

¹¹⁷Propaganda wrote (May 25, 1821) to Father Fortis, the General of the Society of Jesus, ordering him to expel Malou from the Society in case he refused to obey Bishop Connolly (*Ibid.*, "Lettere," vol. 302, fol. 252).

¹¹⁸BCA, Case 14-T6.

¹¹⁹BCA, Case 21-R5.

¹²⁰BCA, Case 17-W52.

¹²¹BCA, Case 18-T47.

Malou announced that Dr. Kelly had arrived and intimated that he was openly taking the part of Bishop Connolly and Father Ffrench.¹²² This news he verified on January 7, 1821. Rumors and counter-rumors sped back and forth between the cities of Baltimore, Philadelphia, New York, Norfolk and Charleston, until the state of the Church was one of bewilderment and sorrow.

In September, 1821, Kohlmann warned the Archbishop that he had received news from Rome that Dr. Connolly had proposed Harold as his coadjutor and the Jesuit Superior gave the advice that one of the bishops, preferably Cheverus, should leave at once for Rome.¹²³ All along the trail of these documents, Malou follows with letter after letter to the Archbishop, repeating the same story—the Irish are in conspiracy to drive the French priests and bishops out of the country. On the one side he sees the Irish priests and bishops, aided and abetted by clever agents among the “Jacobins” (the Irish Dominicans at Rome), and on the other the French priests and bishops who were being assisted by the Jesuits. The climax was reached when the news of Dubois’ election to the succession in New York reached that city.

Out of all this maelstrom of charges and counter-charges, one fact leaps out—woe to anyone who attempted to make peace. Father Power’s painful experience was well known, and from one end of the Church to the other there was no one who dared to enter the New York discussion. All the old causes of the quarrel—financial difficulties with the trustees, preference in the posts of the diocese, and personal jealousies—were forgotten in the larger question of race against race. We have deliberately kept our pages clean from the horrid accusations which *ecclesiastico more* enraged clergymen made against one another. One fact, however, as has been described, was paramount—everything done by the Holy See and by the Church authorities here to bring peace had ended in dismal failure. The Irish believed themselves hemmed in on three sides by French prelates—Plessis in Quebec, Flaget in Bardstown and Maréchal in Baltimore. Upon the three new bishops, all from Ireland, and especially on John England who was recognized as a national leader, they depended to win for them what they believed they were being defrauded of—just representation in the affairs of the American Church.

¹²²BCA, Case 17-Y58.

¹²³BCA, Case 18-T52.

SCHOOLBOY LETTERS BETWEEN JOHN LAFARGE AND HIS FATHER

Contributed by O. H. P. LaFarge

EDITOR'S NOTE—These letters of schoolboy days were written between John LaFarge and his father, John F. LaFarge, during a short period of school life at Mt. St. Mary's College, Emmitsburg, Maryland, in the years 1850 and 1851. Mr. LaFarge sent thither his son, John, then aged fifteen years and six months, with three other boys of the family, Louis, aged thirteen; Henry, eleven, and Alphonse, nine.

John LaFarge objected greatly to being sent there because he desired to continue at Mr. Drisler's school in New York and go to Columbia. His father wished to send him away from New York, partially for the same reasons that boys are sent today, to get them away from the city and out in the fresh air, but very largely because he wanted him to be with and to protect and help his younger brothers. John LaFarge finally acquiesced, inasmuch as his father did not command him to go and made, as it appeared to him at the time, a considerable sacrifice.

The Society is much indebted to Mr. LaFarge for the privilege of adding these charming letters written by his father and grandfather to our RECORDS. They give most interesting glimpses of life in New York, and at the historic "Mountain" during the close of the first half of the last century.

My dear John:

November 2d, 1850.

For several days I have wished to write you to acknowledge reception of the letters that you have written me. I have not been able to find the time.

Your letter of the 9th of the month has given me much pleasure. You appear to be reconciled with the college and I am very contented over it.

If you know when the box that I have sent on the third arrived at the College, you will give me pleasure by writing, because at the express office here, they have assured me that it would arrive in two days and I now see by your letter that you have only had it on the 9th. It should have arrived before all that time. I fear that the pumpkins pies will be stale.

I am so occupied *mon ami*, that I have not been able even to search for the British Poets that I wish to send you. I have sent your letter to Embury. You have not told me a word about your brothers. Louis has not written. Henry and Alphonse have written to me and I have answered them. Tell me if I would do well to let him learn the violin. I fear that that would deter him from his Piano. He too much already ill-embraces restraint. How is his head? They have written me also that my poor little Alphonse has been whipped often. You cannot know the effect that this news has had on me, almost making me ill. Several nights I have not been able to sleep to think that they would punish a poor little one like Alphonse, who I do not think has any vicious habits. I pray you, my dear Johnny to inform yourself what is regulating his attitude, several times I have been on the point of parting to withdraw him from the College.

I have been prevented only by important business that I have at the moment. Do me the pleasure of addressing yourself to the President or to Mr. McClosky on the part of your father and learn, my child, why they punish your little brother. If they cannot care for him at College they can let me know. I have put him there only on account of his brothers, wishing to have you all together, but I fear that they brutalize this poor child in whipping him. I think it is too much to whip to correct a child. The fact is my dear Johnny, that your Mother and myself are unhappy at having you so far from us. We know that it is for your good but what a privation for us. Above all if we know you to be unhappy.

I have only you *mon ami* to give me the news and I beg you to continue to write me as often as you can and not to forget to speak to me of your brothers and pray the President not to whip your little brothers who are too young to have reason. I have not had the heart to answer your letters—I have had a heavy heart in thinking of the little ones.

Adieu my dear Johnny, I embrace you a thousand times. Be of good heart

Thy father who cherishes thee

JOHN LAFARGE

Embrace your brothers for us. Here is a letter from your poor Mother.

New York, 6 November 1850

My dear Johnny:

I had the pleasure of writing you last Saturday the 2nd current. Monday we received the letters that you addressed us on the 28th and 29th of October.

All your reports to us have given us the greatest pleasure. Your poor Mother was so disturbed that she sent to the telegraph office to know if the telegraph extended to Emmitsburgh. She wished to write a telegram fearing you were ill. Your letters have tranquilized her and she is now happy. She is occupied with your flannels and the other things of which you are in need and all will go as well as the other articles that you have asked for in the current letter of this month.

You know that I have provided you with everything that can contribute to your welfare, to your instruction and to your pleasure and that you will receive all that the President of the College can promise you to have. You can write for those things which it will always be a pleasure for me to furnish to you and to your brothers, that can contribute to your happiness at present and to your future well-being. I have already written that I have remitted your letters to d'Hervillé and to Embury. I have seen first one and then the other and they send you their remembrances.

You will find included one letter to Embury. d'Hervillé is going to bring me one that I will send you.

I have seen Woodford. He told me that they do not use Xenophon's *Cyropedia* in his class. If I do not receive a counter order from you, I will send you Orrons. I have begged Woodford to write you, he has promised me to do so. He told me that he would like very much to receive some letters from you. Write him, he is a good boy and gives great satisfaction to his parents.

I see, my dear John, that you are intelligent enough to appreciate the happiness which a child wins when he conducts himself well. He is loved by his father and mother, his masters and comrades and finally by all those about him. Continue my friend what you have so well done up to the present, not only will you be happy but also you will be loved by God and by all who surround you.

Watch, I beg you, your brothers—give them good counsel and

give it to them in such manner that they do not think you act as master. The softness with which one counsels contributes greatly to make them value it. Read them when you can the fables of Fontaine. Take the moral in it which is excellent in all the courses of life, and show them the application.

As I have said, we are occupying ourselves with all that you ask. I have told you how much happiness you have given to your Mother and to me in writing to her. Now I thank you, my child, for myself for your nice letter. It gives me pleasure, all that you report. First the style is excellent, of a sensible person and one accustomed to think and to write. Finally it is very flattering to your father. It is his heart which speaks. Continue, *mon ami*, in good sentiments so well expressed in your letter. Your best friend will always be your father. Love us as we love you. On last Sunday I wrote to Louis, Henry and Alphonse—they will show you my letters. I have said to them all that my love for them and their happiness dictates to me, but I cannot express myself with them as well as with you. They are still very young. I have recommended to them to have much deference for the counsels that you will give them. I hope that when they are a little more disciplined they will obey you better. Be good to them my child—we count a great deal on you to take care of them. Watch above all thy brother Louis, he is so good that he lets himself be led easily. You ought to be his best friend and he ought to like the comrades that you like. His future happiness depends upon the friends that he will choose. Tell him that in case he wishes to be with Uncle Frith instead of being in a Commercial House in New York when he will have finished his education he will be easy to place with his uncle.

The Jenny Lind Hall is finished. They have called it Tripler Hall, of the same name as the person to whom I have rented the land. It is the most beautiful, by its dimensions, that has been built in America. It is 150 feet long—100 feet wide and 50 feet high. Room for 5000 spectators. It has cost \$85,000. It is magnificent. Jenny sings there three times a week and it is full every night she sings. Your Mother and I have heard her and we enjoyed it. I wish we could have you here one evening to hear her.

I began this letter four hours ago and every minute I have been interrupted. I can only find time to write in the evening. I do not like to work by lamp light. My sight is weak and it easily fatigues me.

What can I send to Alphonse for his birthday anniversary? Let me know what will please him.

I have wished to frame the pretty design which you gave me. I have not found it in your album. Where is it? I fear that someone has taken it. Aunt Bancel wept with joy when receiving your letter. She thanks you very much and begs your brothers to write her a few words. I think my dear that her prayers will be exhausted. She is a holy woman if there is one on this earth. Your grandmother is well and has the air of being proud of her daughter and her little children. She thinks that there are none better. I tease her sometimes to make her laugh. Uncle Louis was at the house yesterday evening. He read all your letters. He was well satisfied with them and loves you very much as does also the good Delia.

Your little sisters are well and very good. Francis is also well and we talk constantly to them of you.

Adieu, mon ami, j'embrasse toi et tes frères comme je vous aime et je vous aime beaucoup.

JOHN LAFARGE

New York—November 10, 1850

My dear Johnny:

I had the pleasure of writing you the 6th of the month in answer to your letter of October 28th, which came to me only on Monday the 4th. On the 7th I received your letter of Oct. 31, the 8th, that of the 2nd of November and yesterday that of the 8th.

I have reread all these letters my dear Johnny with much attention and I say in answer that I am more than satisfied. Your mother is also as satisfied as myself and we see with pleasure that you occupy yourself with your brothers as much as yourself. Continue to care and watch over them. Your mother will write to you and will speak of the linen that she sends. As soon as your letters were received I busied myself with what you asked me. Your letters have been sent to d'Hervillé—he promised to

ask Mr. Drisler the best editors and to let us know Mr. Drisler's opinion but up to the present I have not seen him. He ought also to bring me the answer to your letter, perhaps he will come to see me today.

You know my child, that I have sent you to St. Mary's College to accompany your brothers and to make them find their sojourn there more agreeable but I have been determined also by the desire of making you take more exercise. Here you work too much, you were much too sedentary and your health suffered from it and in a few years you would have become an old boy. The physical would have been too feeble for the moral. I tell you this to tranquilize you on the judgment that you will have to stay at College. Do not press too much to return. With your assiduity to work, the memory and the desire to instruct yourself you will soon have enough of mathematics and of prosody to catch up the classes that you desire. So have patience. You know as well as I do that I desire that Louis finish his studies at the same time as yourself. It is necessary that you encourage him to study.

Uncle Frith was here. He came Thursday night and left Friday evening for Canada where he will remain about a fortnight. He told us he would be very glad to have Louis with him when he comes out of College and said that if Louis is to be a merchant that he, Mr. Frith, would claim the preference to teach him the principles of Commerce. He loves you all but is very fond of Louis and thinks he will become a first rate man of business.

When Mr. Bohen turned you out of your room he necessarily had some good reasons. Recommend well to him my dear Johnny, your little brothers who have need of much care.

You had in your trunks and consequently at the College your night shirts. You only have to ask for them. There are only some flannel shirts that your Mother sends you. She thinks that they will be warmer than the cotton shirts that you have. She is adding a night shirt for Louis, who has only two. You each have them in your trunks.

Next Tuesday, after tomorrow, we will dispatch the box, which contains the objects which I send you. I hope that you will receive them. They are as follows:

- 4 Portfolios
- 1 Ream of ruled letter paper. Little Alphonse says he cannot write on paper not ruled because he writes "crooked".
- $\frac{1}{2}$ Ream of pretty note paper.
- 200 Envelopes for note paper
- 200 Envelopes for letter paper
- 2 Flat Rulers—4 Square rulers like those I have.
- 4 Books
- 3 Gross steel pens—1 Doz. large steel pens
2 Doz. pen holders
- 24 Copy books—11 copy books thick. You will divide these with your brothers as you see to be reasonable.
- Anthon's Cicero de Senectute de Amicitia
- " Classical Dictionary
- " Dictionary of Greek & Roman Antiquities
- Herodotus—3 Volumes—Leipsig—last edition
- Homer's Illiad which I have found in your room
- 12 numbers of the Encyclopedie Iconographique
- I little bottle of gum Arabic
- Catalogue of Goupil & Co. Statutes of Columbia College
- Appleton & Putnam do not have catalogues, neither of them.
- They promise to have them.
- 2 Rosarys, one for you and one for Louis
- For Alphonse and Henry, if Henry wishes it—
- 18 leaves colored paper
- 18 little candle sticks
- 7 doz. little wax candles
- 2 little crucifixes
- In order that my boys remember me I send
- 4 pounds of chocolate in tablets
- 4 pounds of Sugar plums

Uncle Louis is sending some pocket combs and pocket glasses and also some skates. I send also three of the five blank books that Mr. Graham has had made for you. They can serve in the moments of leisure. Having countermanded Anthon's Xenophon's Anabasis and Xenophon's Cyropaedia I do not send them. If you have need of books or any other things for your instruction or

your amusement I will send them—always with the permission of the President.

We have learnt that Mr. McCaffrey was at Philadelphia. Let us hope that if he comes to New York we will see him and that he will say that he is pleased with our boys.

If Louis, like yourself, desires to make a present of the Rosary that we send him, we think that it should not be to the same person. It would be better to give something else.

Write to your Grandmother, My dear Johnny, that will give her much pleasure. Speak of your religious exercises that will interest her. "Tante" thanks you. We embrace you all with good heart. The little ones and Franky all speak of you. Little Marie is very pretty. She grows prettier every day. All are well and we, thy mother and myself, are happy to know that you are in good health and happy with your situation.

Adieu je t'embrasse de tout mon coeur.

JOHN LAFARGE

New York—17 November 1850

My dear Johnny:

I had the pleasure of writing you last on the 10th current. I advised you of the sending of a box containing the things which you had asked. This box has only gone by express on Tuesday, the 12th. I hope that it is now in your possession, Uncle Louis having asked Mr. Elder at Baltimore to forward it to you as soon as possible without regard to the expenses.

In the box you will find a little box of Bon Bons (5 lbs.) for Alphonse. I have sent it to him for his birthday. Ask him what yet I can give him for his ten years that he will be on the 3rd of the month. Tante Bancel has put also some things coming from her. Four boxes of prunes that she begs you to eat and think of her. You know all of you, how she loves you.

I have received your letters of the 6th, 8th and 9th of the month. You will know how much pleasure they have given us. We are so happy to learn that everything conducts itself well with you and that they are advancing you. Tell your brothers, my dear Johnny, that they should continue to do well and tell them that they give us happiness and the sorrow that we suffer from your absence is assuaged in receiving the good reports that they

merit. In what concerns you particularly, we are not disturbed. What we recommend to you is not to work too much. Amuse yourself however, without taking too violent exercises which might cause illness. You have not a strong constitution. Take care of yourself. In regard to studies, you are young and have plenty of time to learn. Be careful. I have little news to give you.

Jenny Lind has departed and Madame Pasodi the great cantatrice arrived here at the Astor Place Opera House filling all the conversations of the idle or of the Dilettanti. Madame Bishop gives sacred concerts every Sunday at Tripler Hall. This is the name given to the Hall built for Jenny Lind. You remember this is the Concert Hall and Ball Room built on my land. I have rented this land to Mr. Tripler for 21 years at \$14,000 a year and I have loaned him \$30,000 more to help him build the Hall which cost \$85,000. He pays me the interest on these \$30,000, that I have lent him up to when he reimburses me. He is going to try and build next spring a Hotel on the Broadway façade. This will insure as much more than \$14,000 rent which he has agreed to pay. At the end of 21 years all these buildings as well as the land will belong to you. You know also "Mon Ami" that three years ago I rented to Mr. Secor the house which belongs to me at the corner of Broadway and Canal Street also for 21 years at \$5000 a year. I think that I will rent also the building at Broadway and Reade Street if I can get \$2,500 a year. This will relieve me of all embarrassment and while you are growing the properties will augment in value. You see my boy, how necessary it is for you that you have a good education on all reports, in order to join honorably in your father's work and in order to transmit to your children an honorable existence. All your endeavors are ours. Inculcate these ideas in your Brothers who cannot like yourself, understand what we try to do for you.

I hope that you can also incessantly compose and declaim in your societies, like your comrades. We will receive one of these days your first harangue which will be worth the pains. I have already told you that I only hear good things of you.

I am sorry to learn that your friend Barboza has been obliged to leave college on account of his health. If he comes to New York, give him a word to us, we will receive with much pleasure all your friends as of the others.

Your d'aguerreotype portrait made us laugh. I like the one which we see often, taken by Harrison, better, because it resembles you and is well done. This does not prevent you from sending one in your fashion. Your mother takes great care of the signet that you have sent her. Your Grandmother is very proud of hers. She is especially proud of her Johnny, for herself she thinks no one can surpass him. She will write you, meanwhile, she embraces you.

I am happy, my dear John, that Mr. McLeary has taken you in friendship, after the portrait that you have made of him, he merits all your confident attempts to recompense him for his good will that he has for you. Thank him well on my behalf that he interests himself in you.

I have found your drawing, which I prize greatly, because you made it for me. I have given it to Messrs Goupil to have it put in a pretty frame. You will be glad to see it next summer. I will not encourage you, my dear child, to take up painting in oil for some time yet. Remember what your grandfather and Mr. Simmonet said, that when you draw well, you will learn to paint easily.

The poor masters only wish to paint without occupying themselves with drawing. There is more merit in the study of a head or in the "petit bonhomme", that you made in pencil or with the pen than in all the landscapes (little sheep included) of Mr. R—.

I have sent to Embury the letter that you addressed to me for him and the same day d'Hervillé came to see me and gave me the enclosed for you. He also told me that Mr. Drisler recommends Wheeler's Herodotus. I have asked Mr. Crowen to procure it for me. I will send it as soon as I can, probably by Mr. McClosky.

We received yesterday your letter of the 13th, Wednesday, to your Mother. She is busy with what you ask. She writes to Louis. For that which concerns me in that letter, I have already put aside Taylor's Manual of Modern History and Chambers Encyclopedia of British Literature which I will send you. I will send at the same time all the books you ask for with the permission of the President. If you wish to have the "Courrier des Etats Unis", I will send it. You will see in it some news. Ask if you can have it.

Adieu, mon cher Johnny—Je t'embrasse comme je t'aime.

JOHN LAFARGE

In Coll St. Mariae ad Mtes.
Saturday, 23 Nov. 1850

My dear Father:

I have received your letter of the 17th on Wednesday afternoon. I was not able to answer you yesterday and the day before were days of recreation but today it is snowing hard and I do not see a better way of passing my recreation than in writing you. First of all we thank you again and again for your kindness to us by occupying yourself so much for us when we know very well that your business is interfered with considerably. And we all thank you and my dear mother, Tante Bancel, Grandmaman, Uncle and Aunt Binsse for all the interest in us.

In return for your news I will communicate to you that of the College.

Friday was the feast of St. Cecilia and the Society of St. Cecilia (Musical Society) and the Philomathian Society (Debating Society) had a good dinner. We others, "Chrestomathians" were excluded because we have not the privileges of the Other Societies.

In the evening we had a concert interspersed with speeches, Music by the Saint Cecilians and speeches by the "Philotomates," so named on account of their great love for the so-called vegetable.

I give you below the program:

In Colleg. St. Mariae ad Montes

Nov. 21

CONCERT PROGRAMME

DR. DIELMANN'S MARCH

SPEECH—W. MURRAY

I

Overture—*Dame Blanche*
Violin Solo *Dielmann*
Waltz No. 17
Gallopade
Speech H. FISHER

Overture—*Fra Diavolo*

Clarinet Solo

Waltz

Mountain Polka

II

Overture—*La Clemenza*
Flute Solo
Waltz No. 21
A. B. C. *Mozart*
Speech JOHN IGLEHART

The Concert will commence at 7:00 o'clock P. M.

You see that we have had a good evening. Although the two first speeches were uninteresting, the third was excellent, and was very much applauded.

The author, J. Iglehart, is very much liked in College although he belongs to the Philomathians, who are not so much liked as the Christomathians. That is one of the reasons which has made me join the last.

Johnny Knight belongs to the Philomathians. But to return to Ikey, as his family are going to live in New York he will probably become a New Yorker and I do not doubt that he will enter Columbia College—but he will not graduate before me.

Two of those who "speechified" had their parents there and you can imagine how happy they were.

Thursday we had recreation for a rest and Friday I passed most of the day preparing myself for a debate that we are going to have in the Society and in which I have the worst side. I don't know yet if I will be afraid or not.

Now I have to tell you that the 27th of December will be the speech day and as we have the two most liked boys in the school in our Society we will cede nothing to the Philomathians. Both are French or moreover Louisianais.

Louis has received Maman's letter yesterday and I have received from her the letter from Embury.

I have received also Mr. Lagroix's letter. Tell him I will answer it but I am afraid of making mistakes in French.

Say to "Tante" that Mr. McClosky has cut out the little designs on my box and on Louis' because they represented some ladies "with low necked dresses" but this does not prevent the prunes from being excellent and I am much obliged to "Tante".

I brought with me, or perhaps there was in the box of books, two drawings representing some Ladies' costumes. Mr. McClosky told me that he thought them lost but I do not know whether they were sent. Will you please see.

Say to Mama that I prefer all or nearly all that comes from home the best, because we cannot have them here.

As to the shoes it is not only the heels which are too heavy but it is the leather of which they are made and they have made my feet sore. I have never had my feet in worse condition. I

have asked if I could not have better shoes made here and they have told me that it would be best to use those obtained here in order to accustom myself to them; but while I accustom myself to them there is a struggle between the shoe and the foot and up to the present time the foot has the worse of it.

My dear father, you advise me not to learn painting and I think I will do as you tell me.

The drawing master here, although an excellent man, is not very strong on drawing and resembles Mr. R. in his manner of making landscapes, excepting that he does them infinitely worse.

However, I take drawing and he has given me what is most difficult. I thank you for having asked Crowen to get this book of Wheeler's and I hope he will obtain it for me.

Will you be so kind as to add to the other books—two little volumes in 32 which you will find I think, in your office and which treat of Archeology. They will be useful to me for my classical studies in everything relating to other people than the Greeks and Romans. Above all in the antiquities and the Mythology of the Egyptians and the Gauls. The work is written by Champollion. I do not know that I am deceiving myself—Do not think that I work too much here. I study only a small amount of what I studied in New York.

Embury says in his letter that Woodford is the first in his classes at College but he does not like the fact that I graduate two years before him.

Good-bye my dear father—Excuse my writing for it is very cold. Embrace everybody for me.

Encore adieu mon père.

Votre fils affectionné

JOHN LAFARGE

P.S. Henry is very happy with his flageolet and with his accordion. He was a little bit ill on Friday (perhaps on account of some cakes) but he is well now. However this morning I have not given him his cake (which you had sent him) because I thought that this would make him still ill.

My dear father as I like so much better to write on note paper than on letter paper, because it seems to me that I have less paper to cover at the beginning of each page, I will be happy if you

will send me with the books, a small quantity of fine note paper. This is very pretty and very white but it seems to me that I do not write as well on it as on finer paper. It is I think too heavy. It is as you wish, but I am ashamed to see a letter addressed to you, so badly written.

Adieu—adieu nous vous embrassons tous.

New York, 1st December '50

My dear Johnny:

I received your letters of the 23rd and 24th of November yesterday. We waited for it since Henry's letter of the 21st. Henry told us that he had a fever and that he was suddenly taken ill and as we did not know the gravity of his indisposition we were very much disturbed, so much so that your Mother was determined to go to the College in spite of all the representation that I was able to make. So yesterday we had your letter. I beg you "Mon Ami" write us once a week even when this is only to say to us that you are not ill. If you cannot write let it be Louis, Henry or Alphonse.

We wish to have your news once a week. I hope that poor little Henry is recovered. Embrace him for us as well as Louis and Alphonse.

We have also Alphonse's letter. Tell him that we thank him for writing us. We are going to get some caps and we will see to all the things that you ask us for, as well as the books and some paper before Christmas unless we find an opportunity sooner.

Crowen has written to Boston for Wheeler's. I hope that he will obtain it. Newman has promised me some shoes for you and Louis. I have put the two little volumes of Champollion to one side to send to you tomorrow. I will buy the bottle of gold paint.

I will look also for note paper and letter paper better than that which I have sent to you.

Tomorrow I will send your letters to d'Hervillé and Embury. I have already said to them that I would be glad to send all the letters that they wish to write and they have promised to profit by my offer.

I will look for the engravings of costumes of which you speak to me in your letter.

If my affairs will permit it, I shall love to go to join you on the 27th of this month, not only to have the pleasure of hearing your debates but to embrace you. If I can be sure of going without your Mother wishing to accompany me it will be possible for me to go and see you. Meanwhile, my children, have patience, conduct yourselves well. Love us well. Take care of yourselves and write to us often.

For two days I have had rheumatism in the neck which makes me suffer. I have had a great deal of headache and I have had difficulty in seeing. I am always very much occupied and even more than ordinarily.

We are all interested in each letter that we receive and they give us the greatest pleasure.

Grandmaman says now that she will love to give some shillings to Alphonse and Henry in exchange for some kisses. Grandmaman, Tante Bancel and Maman embrace you. Louisa is charming, Emily also and little Marie is always very good. Frank is becoming a little rascal. He is beginning to talk and makes as much noise as all you four. He speaks of the Squirrel and of the Rabbit that we have promised him. He also wants a pigeon. He will put them all in the summer house at Glen Cove.

You do not tell me when Mr. McCloskey is going to come to New York. He is late in seeing us. He will give us your news. Direct Louis to write often.

Adieu mon cher Johnny, Je t'embrasse bien tendrement et de toute mon âme.

Ton père

JOHN LAFARGE

I notice that you have imitated my signature in your letter.

December—1850

My dear Father :

I write you these words to say to you that as I can easily read here "Goldsmith" and "Cowper" (which I did not know before) I will not need these books.

If you wish, will you buy me the works of "Walter Savage

Landor" and of "Coleridge", because I cannot procure them here.

Your son, who I am afraid, asks you too many things.

JOHN LAFARGE

The English edition would be preferable if there are any.

In Coll. St. Mariae ad Mtes
Monday 2 December 1850

My dear Father:

I have been again advanced in my classes and consequently I have an hour more free three times a week. I employ it today to write to you. I have received your letter of the 24th Wednesday last. I have twice started to write to you but have been interrupted each time by the clock for my classes. I thank you very much for having searched for the Herodotus for me. I hope that you can find it. It will be useful to me.

I am happy that Antonico is going to come to this country and I hope he will come to college at St. Mary's. I have no news to communicate to you relative to us except that the two little ones are learning singing in order to be able to sing in the choir. The President has told me many things on their account. He said that although at the beginning their conduct was very good they were more or less disorderly. It is not that they were bad boys but they made too much noise and are too free and easy. Alphonse is the best of the two but he has already been whipped once. I spoke to them in regard to their conduct but Alphonse is the only one who has improved since.

Tell Maman that I think she is mistaken in saying that I only have my winter clothes here. She was at Philadelphia when they packed our trunks. As to my trousers, I wish to say that the trousers are of the light cloth which we use in summer. It is warm for New York but not for the Blue Ridge as we have a pretty little wind from the north which comes down from the mountains. We already have snow here. Has it snowed in New York?

In my last letter I said that I had not yet received the rosaries. I received them Friday. They are very pretty. Louis told me, however, that he would love to have a little coral one. We have

not found the "games" very useful. The one that Maman sent me lacks something. It is as if one had sent a checker board without the pieces. Otherwise, I do not know if the "Jeu de dames" which you have is employed every day. My dear Father, I have still some books to ask of you. You can send those that you will let me have at the first opportunity, I suppose if Antonico comes here, as well as the Herodotus and the note paper which I have already asked for. The books are:

"The Captives" a comedy of Plautus, with English notes for the use of students by J. Proudfit, 18mo paper 37½ cents, to be had at Harper and Brothers. I suppose at any other book store. If you have the time cover it if you please. Crowen covers very well.

Dryden's Work

Goldsmith's Works

Marco Polo's Travels

As to the last, I do not care so much, but as I am trying poetry I would love to have these two poets—Dryden and Goldsmith.

I have not received a letter from you since the 24th. A whole week has passed. I hope that you will write soon. Apropos, perhaps I will write Eudoxie.

Adieu my dear father, when I think of the other boys who will return at Christmas, I am sorry that you live so far away.

We are all well. I hope that you are all well also

Votre fils affectionné

JOHN LAFARGE

Embrace everybody for me.

In Coll. St. Mariae ad Montes
Friday, December 5th, 1850

My dear Father:

Yesterday, as it was letter-writing day. I wrote to you and I have received your letter of the 1st. I am very sorry to hear that Henry's letter has troubled you.

I did not know that he had written you. He was ill only two days and during that time not at all seriously. He is now perfectly well. I thank you very much for your kindness to us for procuring for us everything which we asked for.

Since I wrote my letter of November 24th, I found the costumes. I wish we could have you here for Christmas but it would be impossible for Maman to come. The roads are so bad and a woman is so out of place at college. You could then hear some good speeches I assure you.

Mr. McClosky does not know when he will go to New York. I hope that you have received my letter of the 4th.

Excuse my handwriting. My hands are so cold that I can scarcely hold the pen.

Your affectionate son,

JOHN LAFARGE

P.S. In my last letter, I asked you to buy the Voyages of Marco Polo. I do not need them. I would prefer Bristed's Catullus, published I think by Putnam, but Crowen will procure them for you.

New York, 9th December 1850

My dear Johnny:

I wrote you last Sunday. I hope you received my letter. I ask you to let me know what I ought to send you for your Christmas presents. It is necessary to know what you want so that I can send it in time.

For eatables I will send you "fromage de Cochon", Boulogne sausage and "fromage de Gruyere" (which you like very much) if there is any in the City. I can also send you some figs in boxes. Henry and Alphonse asked me for some sardines. It is very easy to send them to you but how will you open the tin boxes? and also I fear that you will cover your clothes with oil. If you know something that you want to have, write me.

I have not received any letter from you this week. I hope that you are not indisposed. I think that you have been prevented by your studies.

Up to the present I have not been able to procure Wheeler's Herodotus. There are no more in Boston, the edition is exhausted. What is the edition which serves you at College?

Up to the present Embury and d'Hervillé have not sent any responses to your letters. If I receive them tomorrow I will send them to you.

We have been very much troubled my dear Johnny to learn that our Alphonse was without a cap. You will have to ask for one from Mr. McClosky for him and if he has not any at College buy one at College. I do not want this poor little one to catch cold. It is too cold for him to go without his head covered. Watch over him and Henry, my dear child.

You have reason and good sentiment for your brother and you will give us happiness in taking care of them as well as you can. I beg of you to say to Mr. McClosky that I desire that you lack nothing that is necessary. I will provide all the money necessary for your needs and for your comfort and for your education.

Your cousin Antonico Bacot arrived yesterday from Cardenas. I think that his mother will send him with you to Mt. St. Mary's. He is larger and stronger than you. He is sixteen years old and his mother says that he is not very advanced in his instruction. He resembles Eudoxie a good deal and seems to be a very good boy. He should be a good comrade for you. He speaks French and Spanish.

Mr. Lagroix has written today to Henry. He will be happy to receive a letter from him.

I wrote yesterday to your brothers and not being able to write you I have sent you many compliments and embraces from those who cherish you. This morning I have not had the courage to send letters for your brothers to the Post without joining some words for you at the same time.

Write me my dear boy as often as your study and your amusements permit you. Some lines from you saying that you are happy and well and that your brothers are well, will satisfy me.

Adieu, mon cher John, God Bless you and inspire you only with love of goodness.

Je t'embrasse comme je t'aime de toute mon âme

Ton bon père

JOHN LAFARGE

New York, December 11, 1850

My dear Johnny:

I wrote you on the first of the month and on Monday last the 9th. I addressed you a few words before sending the letters

that I wrote your brothers. Monday night we received your letter of the 2nd. From the report of your advancement, *Mon Ami*, it gives me great pleasure and I am persuaded that you advance always because you understand or seek to understand everything you read—that you have an excellent memory and all the good judgment that a boy of your age can have. Continue my dear John to give us satisfaction in all that concerns you.

Take care of your health and thank God well for the gifts which he has given you.

From the moment that your Mother read your letter, she became sad, began to weep and has continued up to the present her sadness. What you tell me of the two little ones has made her feel very badly. The idea of knowing her poor Alphonse was whipped for bad conduct tormented her. He is only ten years old and he has been at College only two months. We know that he is good, that he has no vice—only a little unsubordination which belongs to his age.

I think then that they ought to be indulgent without breaking the rules of the College.

I say as much for Henry, who, although older than his brothers, is also a child and a much more lively character. Ask my friend Mr. McCaffray to show them some indulgence. I am persuaded that they will conduct themselves well hereafter.

Your little sister Emily tells me this morning at breakfast that she knows that Maman is going to go to College as soon as little Marie can be separated from her and that she will bring back Alphonse and leave Henry and Loulon and Johnny at College. It appears that she overheard your mother say this, although she has said nothing to me.

On account of this I have had doubt whether I should prevent your Mother from going to see you this winter at first because it is too cold to travel, that she would suffer and that I am sure that she would bring back Alphonse which would be bad for the child, who would find himself here alone and would do nearly anything that he wished. A box goes this morning for you. It is addressed like the other one to Revd. Mr. McCaffray, it contains some caps, stockings of wool, trousers etc., for you and your brothers. I have put in the books which you have asked of me.

The Wheeler is a second-hand one. Mr. Wiley has procured it for me. It is impossible to get any other. I have put in a half ream of note paper, which I hope you will find good. There is a prayer book for Henry or Alphonse. I do not know which one asked for it.

Two little statues of the Virgin that Alphonse has asked for, one of which I think is for one of his friends from Guadaloupe—two dozen little candles. I have also put in for Alphonse a little Virgin in a chapel. That will please him. Give him some good advice my dear Johnny and give it to him in such a way that he will receive it well and will follow it. As much for Henry and Louis and recommend them both to the indulgence of their teachers.

I have put in the box also two boulogne sausages, please be kind enough to divide them one for you and Louis and one for Henry and Alphonse. I would have sent you some thing else but they could not put any with your trousers, etc. Some other time.

I think that Maman has also been downcast with the reflection that you made on the distance which prevents us from seeing you at Christmas. You do not know my dear children how much we love you and how much we suffer from you being so far away. Have patience: on the first of July we will be reunited for a couple of months.

In the letter from your Mother you will find one from Embury. I think that every first Wednesday of the month you ought to write me. Up to the present I have not received the letters of last Wednesday.

Adieu my dear John—do well—take care of your brothers. Take care of your health and love me as I love you.

Je t'embrasse de toute mon âme. J'embrasse aussi tes frères.

Adieu ton père

JOHN LAFARGE

In Coll. St. Mariae ad Montes
Wednesday, 11th December 1850

My dear Father:

A whole week and I have received no letter from you. Every day when Mr. Bohn gives out the letters I run to see if there is

one for me. Then when there is not I console myself in thinking that the next day perhaps I will have one. Today three months have passed since we left. We now have six or eight months more.

I wish we could have you here at Christmas, as you said, and I hope that your business will permit it, because I am sure that Maman will not try to come and then you have promised we would have you here. Mr. Pilot came the day before yesterday with his son Aristide. After having visited here for some hours he left for Washington. I do not think that Pilot will come here, he found the outlook too deserted.

Really, when one sees the College in winter, after midday, the aspect is not very encouraging as a college. The wind whistles in the corridors and all the trees on the mountains are agitated by the wind. In summer it is very pretty on account of the greenness but in winter it is bare and deserted.

Soon the clock will strike and I will not have time to finish my letter.

Adieu, dear father, take care of yourself and embrace everyone in the house for me.

JOHN LAFARGE, JR.

Will you be so kind as to join with the other books I have asked for "Brooks Greek Pastoral Book"

If you cannot procure it ask if you please for an edition of "Theocritus"

In Coll. St. Mariae ad Mtes.
Friday, 12 Decembre 1850

Dear Father :

Today is a day of recreation and as a consequence I have more time free, I seize the chance to answer your letter of the 9th, which I received yesterday. In this letter you ask what we wish for presents for Christmas. It seems to me, dear father, that we have received nothing but presents since we have been here. Truly you are very good. Louis said that for his part, he would write you this evening and then he can ask you. As to Henry and Alphonse, they do not know what to choose. They will have determined by this evening, I hope. We thank you very much for the eatables which you have sent us. Are they for us all?

I thank you for having searched for that Herodotus for me—it matters very little if you cannot find it. We use the Leipsic edition here, but it only has the text. You wrote me on the subject of Alphonse's cap. I am very sorry and I admit that is partly my fault, but the boys do not complain to me of these things. I only see them from time to time. But I promise that every time Alphonse complains to me I will try and help him. In regard to my brothers, I have to tell you that Alphonse has changed his conduct is very very bad and I am afraid that today even, he will be whipped.

There is not a day that he is not punished. If it was only for his classes it would not be so bad, but it is nearly always on account of his conduct.

Henry also is punished very often but mostly for his classes. He is excessively idle. Louis, although punished often for his Latin did very well in Arithmetic. Truly he merits praising. For a period of a month or six weeks he has always been reputed as the best of his class after one other pupil. As he is going into commerce, it is not of any great importance that he should know Latin. As for myself, I am afraid of failing in Mathematics. If this is the case, I will beg you to let me leave the College. But you will receive our "Relative Standings" for all in the month of January.

I notice that Henry has written to you, because I did not want to give him some of the eatables. Mr. Bolin told me that I did well, he had been ill and the meat would have made him ill. Accordingly we have begun today only to open that and also in order to console him, I have given him part of my chocolate.

However, if we equalize the different things he cannot complain of my injustice. I do want to have nothing more to do with Henry, and with that I am going to conclude my letter.

Adieu, embrace all for me.

Votre fils affectionné

JOHN LAFARGE

Midday.

If you wish for me to ask something for my birthday, unless you think that I have not already asked enough, I wish that you would send me a pretty Album. Smaller than the one you gave me formerly and if you will please ask Maman to cover it for me.

Louis, I have just discovered this morning, having left my box of colors lying around, the box has been broken a little on the corners and most of the colors have been broken by the smaller scholars.

In my next I will give you a list of colors that I want.

You can have Mr. Miller buy them as he promised them to me.

Adieu, Adieu

Mt. St. Mary's, 13 December, 1850

My dear Mother:

I received your letter of the 9th this morning—along with father's, and after having answered father's sat down to answer yours. Indeed, my dear Mother, I am much obliged to you for getting all those things which I asked you, as are also Louis, Henri and Alphonse.

Concerning the latter, you say that you are sad on account of his whipping. Poor Alphonse, I assure you, did not receive it on account of any real misconduct but on account of his continued disorder. I know that he was not at all hurt by it, for he only got three blows on his fingers. He was whipped to shame him but not to hurt him. Besides you know that this College is very severe and that he must submit to the regulations. However, I am sure that if father would wish it, he would not be whipped, though I am sorry to say, he has been punished every way almost. He is not led on by any comrades, it appears to me. So, my dear Mother, do not trouble yourself about it. Mr. McCaffrey thinks that he will become better in his conduct since he has spoken to him.

We are all much obliged to you for all you sent and for the directions about our clothing, as is also Louis for the beads and Alphonse for those little statuettes and we all send you our love and thanks as well as for all the others.

Your affectionate son,

JOHN

My dear Mother:

Did you send in your letter that of Embury?

Kiss all my sisters and little Frank as well as Grandma, Aunt, Uncle, and Aunt Binsse and remember me to Mr. Lagroix.

In Coll St. Mariae ad Mtes

Friday Dec. 13, 1850

Dear Father:

Bishop Gartland arrived yesterday with Mr. Knight. We have a recreation today and I am profiting by it to answer your letters.

I am very sorry that my letter made Maman sad, however, what I said of Alphonse and of Henry was true. I have tried to make them see that they ought to behave well, but Alphonse has not understood me and Henry tells me to mind my own business. However, they have not been whipped any more. That is to say, Alphonse, for they have only menaced Henry. Today the President spoke with them and they have promised to behave better.

So do not be troubled on account of that. When Alphonse was whipped it was not badly. You know they whip often in the Grammar School but I hope that since they have seen the President they will conduct themselves better. I thank you very much for your kindness towards us in sending the books, etc. The Wheeler will be very useful. Thank Maman for the trouble she has taken over our clothes, as well as my Aunt who, I am sure, has done a great deal for us. Alphonse thanks you for the things he asked you for.

I have written as well as all my brothers last Wednesday but the President perhaps has not sent them. It may be because he he has forgotten or because he did not wish to send them on account of something in the letter which did not please him and now, my good father, as I write also to Maman, I embrace you and I sign myself,

Your affectionate son,

JOHN F. LAFARGE, JR.

Mt. St. Mary College,

24th December 1850

My dear Father:

The occupation that the arrival of Antonico and Pilot gave me has prevented my writing sooner and answering your letter. When you told me that you would probably come here at Noel, I was almost sure that your affairs would prevent you. So the

news that you would not come has caused me sorrow but did not astonish me. I know that you have much business and that it is difficult for you to leave it.

As I have already written you, it seems to me that it would have been almost impossible for Maman to come here. The roads are so bad and we are now in the middle of winter.

Aristide Pilot, his father and Antonico arrived here Saturday the 21st, late in the evening. Aristide seems to wish to become a good boy and seems to be ashamed for having been bad so long. I think that he will become good for the rules are strict and he has not much chance to be bad. The only thing that he can do that is bad, although, he seems to wish to give up this bad habit, is to chew tobacco, something in which most of the boys are well versed. To tell the truth, I am sure that there are not more than four chewers, but if some chew, not every one does, and neither Louis nor myself, I am sure, are such pigs as to habituate ourselves to such a thing.

As you say, Antonico seems a reasonable boy. However, he does not know enough of the customs of the college and it will be very difficult to initiate him, in the affairs of the college. Moreover, I do not know enough of the customs of the college to be able to aid him at all, but I have done all that is possible for me to explain the little difficulties that he will meet. But in six or seven months I think that he will accustom himself to college. It will be necessary for him to know a little English before then and that he understands that at college one cannot have all the little things that one has at home. For example, the second evening he wished to have some sugar and water brought to his room.

However, I think he will be liked by his comrades as he has an excellent nature.

Maman and you have told me that you sent several things, as well as some books, some head cheese, etc., but I do not know how it is for Antonico. It has not been said whether this is for him and if not when and how have they been sent?

And also for all that you have sent or that you are going to send I thank you very much for us all.

We wish you all a Merry Christmas and a Happy New Year,

although we cannot call it Merry perhaps at this hour (7½ in the evening) my little sisters are going to bed as well as Franky—to wake up the next morning with all the presents of Santa Claus in their stockings.

It is the first Noel that we have passed far from home and it certainly is a time that one misses his "Home Sweet Home."

Adieu, cher père

Portez vous bien

Votre fils affectionné

JOHN LAFARGE, JR.

P.S. Say to Maman that I have received my cravat and Louis his coat and his gloves and also that I have not yet asked if they have the Freeman's Journal in the Reading Room.

Thank her very much also for the offer that she has made to subscribe for us to this journal but I do not think that I would have any need for it.

I am not able to give to Antonico any good things for I do not know whether there is enough, as we have not received all of which you have spoken, in fact, of the eatables, only the sausages.

Adieu Encore

Cher père

JOHN

Embrace everybody at home for me. I am very sorry not to be able to see the joy of the children at their Christmas presents.

In Coll St. Mariae ad Mtes.

Saturday, Dec. 28th, 1850.

My dear Father:

I have written you on Monday but was unable to put the letter in the post and have much to tell you of news. I continue.

At Noel we got up at three o'clock, awakened by the "Adeste Fideles," and then we heard the midnight mass and immediately afterward the morning mass. After the masses, they proceeded to the election of those who serve at table on Christmas day, for you know they are chosen by the students and those who are elected regard it as a great favor. The number of the elected are nine. We had a very good dinner and we were very much amused. Thursday, the 26th, a day of recreation. We have done almost

nothing. We awaited impatiently the next day. Finally Friday morning we had an excellent breakfast but as it was the fete of St. John the Evangelist, I was obliged to wait on the table.

We amused ourselves by skating after that, or, moreover, the others did because I had not learned. Louis has begun but he has not been able to skate with his skates. Finally, after an excellent dinner and a better dessert accompanied with a glass of wine for all the "servers" we others of the Society arranged room for the evening's concert followed by supper and immediately afterward we took our places on the stage. We had some music and a speech—"St. Louis of France," by R. J. Smith of Louisiana; then more music and again a speech on "Imagination" by Edouard Seghers of New Orleans. It was an excellent speech and, finally, following some airs we had a long and joyous speech "Christmas Times" by Phléger Melançon of Louisiana. The President thought this last speech was so good and so drolely written, that he gave us a holiday the next day. You can appreciate that we made no objection and that is why I am finding time to write you this morning.

I received the box this morning. There were mince pies, gruyere cheese, crackers, fig bonbons, head cheese, and sausage or tongue, for I have not opened the last package.

But, I have not received the books—the "Catullus" etc. of which you speak, were they in the box?

Perhaps, as Mr. McCloskey opens all the boxes he has retained them to look at them.

We are having a class after dinner and I want to take such exercise as I can, *Adieu*.

My dear Papa

Merry Christmas and Happy New Year to all

Your affectionate son,

JOHN LAFARGE, JR.

Tell Uncle Louis that they have "Freeman's Journal" in the Reading Room. I can read it any time I wish.

College of Mt. St. Mary,
Wednesday, 8th January, 1851

My dear Father:

Here it is the 14th day of letter writing since I have been here.

When I look back and see the time that I have been here I cannot accustom myself to it.

It seems to me that I have been here but a few days and the last days I have passed with you appear to me to be only yesterday. But six months have yet to pass, six long months it appears to me, before seeing you again but if they pass quickly as those which have already passed I have not a long time still.

We are now the 8th of January, of the year 1851 and I hope to begin the year and end the year well. We have passed Christmas very happily—all the boys have been well amused. We were almost too lazy to play the last day of vacation.

Now we are beginning our studies and the examinations are approaching and it is necessary to study hard. I hope you will not receive a poor report.

Your affectionate son,

JOHN LAFARGE

January 22, 1850

My dear mother & father

Henry received your last letter. I suppose you heard of the robbery in the church of the silver chalice Ostentoruium and a great many other things. Yesterday or the day before yesterday some robbers came in the night to rob the church they stoled an amount of a great deal silver they then went to the scholl house and made a fire to warm theirselves when the man who keeps the church came up he was surprised to see the window open and the markes of footsteps he ran to tell the secton and I forgot to mention that they stoled a polker at the scholl house and then went to "St. Francis" Church where they took several things they were going to take the chalice what had the Blessed Sacrament on when they let it fall in the middle of the altar they were so frightened that they ran back again to our church where they staid about the mountain one or two days. the next morn-ing the polker was found at St. Francis when they rubbers made use of it to force open the Tabernacle when the school house claimed it as their. Mr. McClosky went to town and had put up a bill written on "Stop the thief" Reward 500 \$ who finds the thief who has stoled Chalice Ostentoruium and other valuable

property of Mt. St. Marys College Church nothing has been seen of them except once. The only thing they took in town 25 beafstakes, 5 bushels of potatoes which they feasted on at the school houce. Mr. McCaffrey is trying to raise subscriptions if you would be so kind as to send 10 dollars in gold I would present them to Mr. McCaffrey if you send them send them in my letter directed to me Goodbye your effecionate son

A. LAFARGE
Mt. St. Mary's Coll.

Friday, Feb. 7th (Evening)

Dear Mother :

I received your letter of the 2nd of this month on Wednesday afternoon. Being occupied all Thursday and all this morning, I have been obliged to wait until now to answer your letter. I had written to you about Mr. McCaffrey's not allowing me to have Landor and Coleridge. As to the first, he has told me why he objected to it, but he said nothing of the second except that he would not let me have it. Since that I find that the Philomathian Library has a complete edition of Coleridge and it has passed through Mr. McCaffrey's hands and yet he will not let me have mine. Perhaps because I am a Christomathian. When I wrote to you for the books I asked one of our teachers—Mr. McCleary—whether the books would be allowed. He said that certainly Coleridge would be allowed and that he thought that Landor might, though part of his Ghebair was objectionable.

About Harry's sore head, I think that what Mr. McClosky says is true—namely; that it proceeded (for it is over) from over-feeding, or rather feeding in too rich things. He ate the sausages, I find out, without any bread, or at least the greatest part of it, and at recreations he is most of the time over at the sister's confectionery shop. I have also got something like his sickness—namely; little pimples over the forehead, proceeding, I believe, from the same, etc., being very highly seasoned, (perhaps so as to disguise the taste).

This does not itch and is to me no inconvenience yet it has a bad appearance. About the Nougat, I don't care at all now, but I suspect Harry from what has followed about our last box.

I am glad to be able to inform you that Mr. Bohen the first prefect says he is very much pleased with Alphonse who begins to behave well and is only punished (with lines) occasionally. He says, however, that Harry is the worst little boy he ever saw and as he does not like to flog him constantly he will entrust that part to the President. Antonico seems to want to go to Mr. Peugnets and talked of nothing else all the time, says he is sure it is a better college than this one and that there at least they teach a person Spanish. I told him what I thought of the place but he says that it matters not about other things he only wants to learn Spanish and French. English will come by itself (the latter is true). He must leave off the flute for one day. He spit blood and I told him I thought it advisable for him to inform Mr. McCloskey and the music teacher of it. As to his not having made his first communion, I perceived it immediately and so no doubt have all others for the first day he was there (Sunday) he asked me what was the use of going to Church and told me that in Cuba it was not the fashion "*personne ne fait celà.*" But since that he has received a great deal of religious instruction from Pere Xanpi, one of the French priests with whom he is the greater part of the time on Thursdays and Sundays. I have not yet asked Louis to try on that coat of mine but I will tomorrow morning. I would have no objections to your bringing on one for me especially as I only wear one now. The others being too light and the other one being stored away (for exhibition?) I hope dear Mother that you will soon come on and we all expect you impatiently. Only two weeks more or not much more *than* that.

I told you in my last that I would send on a list of those things I would like you to bring and I now subjoin it. Do not laugh at the heterogeneous mixture. Louis will give his too and I will tell Harry and Alphonse to do the same, so here goes.

- 1st—some more of the paper on which I am writing for it is almost all out, having been divided among us four. At least my portion is almost out.
- 2nd—Some more envelopes and some pen holders and a box of pens.
- 3rd—Some more Gum Arabic and for my particular use a comb

(common) as you know I like them—that is to say very fine and a fine tooth comb for Sunday operations on Saturday evening also one of those little brushes for cleaning fine tooth combs.

4th—Some “Ivory tinted paper” if you stop in Philadelphia long enough to get it.

5th—A box of Faber pencils—a cord for my eye glass.

6th—a bottle of gold paint.

Now for the books although I think I ask too much.

Please bring for me the “Republique Romanice” by Michelet. It is in three small, smaller than duodecimos I believe or in four and was in the left hand side of the library downstairs in the “little Parlor”. Then the works of Molière and Corneille for the former is in one of the libraries and I suppose therefore will be allowed, as to the second of the two no objection can be raised against it and now I would ask of Father, though I do nothing but ask, if he would purchase for me Longfellow's Poems and also Longfellow's Evangeline which last is found separate. Concluding with this long list, I kiss you again and again and hope that we may soon meet.

Your affectionate son,

JOHN

Kiss all at home for me and little Maylie.

I would also like the “Orientales” of V. Hugo. They are I believe upstairs in the center division of father's library bound in marble paper—1 vol. duo decimo.

Mt. St. Mary's Coll. March 31, 1851.

Dear Ma:

Today being my birthday and as I have not written since last week I thought that I would write a few lines to you. I received your letter of the 21st some time ago but as no mention was made in it of the letter I wrote you since your departure I expected every day a letter. We are both very well though I have yet the cough I had when at Mrs. Miles. It is rapidly leaving me. Since yesterday (Sunday) I have been much troubled with my nose bleeding, though it has done a great deal of good. It bled as often as eight or nine times during the day and always very

violently. However, as before, I had had headaches and this is curing them. I don't care much. Today I asked the President to go to Natural Philosophy Class and he took the occasion to give me a young lecture on laziness.

Antonico is getting well. He has been up on crutches since a week though he can just move about very slowly. However, 'tis a great relief to him after having been so long on his back. I amuse myself very well—and am almost all day long (recreations, I mean) with Johnny Knight and Silas Chatard.

I received our cakes, etc., on Thursday last. The ladies on the prune boxes were *not* martyred (!!!) The only talk now is of vacations and it will be so until the 25th of June. But I made a mistake. Mr. McCaffrey has thought proper (and it is so) to have the boys heads well shaved (bobbed, I mean) and some of them do not like to part with their locks. I would send a sketch of some of them but they are so frightful I am afraid you might take them for monkeys. Today in the refectory, we had something in the gospel about shaving the heads and as you may think, there was a general roar.

My dear Ma, I think that I will have a good many things to ask you to send in the box when it comes, no bulky things but some little nick-nacks. Apropos, tell Father that, as he seemed to be sorry that I could not graduate next year, my teachers of Latin and Mathematics think that I could do it along with J. Knight and S. Chatard, but we prefer waiting, all three, till year after next.

And besides, as I have heard that the new three cent pieces are out, I wish you would send me one, in a letter. You can paste it I believe, within—as I have seen it done for gold dollar pieces.

And Goodbye,

Dear Ma,

*Porte te bien et embrasse tout
le monde à la maison pour
nous Ton fils affectionné*

JOHN

My dear Mother:

Mt. St. Mary's, January 5th, 1851

I received your welcome letter yesterday, 4th, and found that

you had not yet received my letters of the 25, 26, 27 & 28, as well as a letter to d'Hervillé which was inclosed in the same envelope. There I assured you of the receipt of the box on the 28th. I thank you much for the overcoat—Father was right in thinking he had sent me some note paper but he sent me no ruled letter paper, at least Mr. McCloskey says that there was none in the box. Antonico received a letter from his mother, and from Grandmother, it appears that his mother does not like his being placed here for he came running to me yesterday saying "*Je vais quitter le Collège*, all right". I received a letter from Uncle Louis about a month ago and I feel so ashamed of not having answered it that I do not like to write one now. Besides he told me that he though I would learn as much at this College as at Columbia if we were to trust the professors, but he is mistaken if he thinks that we do. For example, we read now in 2nd Greek Herodotus, which according to the professors ought to be read in the 4th year. Now I am sure that I have lost almost all I knew when I came here. I had during the last year formed habits of study but now as I have lazy teachers in Greek and in Algebra, I am rapidly losing. If I were to be examined I am sure that it will be found true. This is a severe school but a boy if he likes can do nothing at all.

Perhaps my discontent may arise from my having been punished (for the first time) very severely for having missed a lesson. I have 270 lines to write for having missed 42—besides they are in Greek. No matter, I won't be punished so again by that teacher for I am going to ask Mr. McCaffrey to go down in my classes rather than have any thing to do with such a tyrannical teacher. I am sure that with Mr. Drisler I never missed a lesson, though he never punished us.

But let me go on, I have tried on my boots and they fit very well. They are good and strong and less tough than Mr. McCloskey's which hurt my feet so much. We have got on our thick flannels but not our outer clothing. I am not cold in bed so I do not want my extra coverings and I do not believe that Harry and Alphonse are. We do not want any other cravats. I thank you and so do the others for what you sent us but have the books I asked for been sent? Tell Father that he made a slight mistake

when I asked for Dryden, I did not mean his translation of Virgil which surely would not pass, I desired especially his "Leopard & Hind", if that is the name, but as I believe it cannot be obtained single, I asked for his works. Mr. McCaffrey seemed to think that I had sent for it to help me along in my Virgil and I am very sorry he did think so.

Good Bye dear mother, tell dear Grandma that I feel too angry now against the school to write to her but that the next letter will go to her.

P.S. Jan. 6. Yesterday just before Mass Mr. McCloskey called me up to his room to give me a little box which contained a letter from you and father of the 21st and a rosary for Louis or if Louis takes the other better for me. I think it has been a long time coming. In the letter I found a list of the eatables contained in the box with directions that I should not let the little ones eat them immediately, but as I gave them immediately to them (for I remembered the fuss Harry made when I did not give him any ham on account of his being sick). The consequence was that their share distributed to them on the 28th, consisting of—

- 4 pies for Harry & Alphonse
- 2 Parcels fancy crackers
- 2 Seed Biscuits
- 3 New Years Cakes
- All the cookies
- 2 drams figs
- 2 head cheeses
- 4 Sausages
- 1 gruyere
- 6 bundles assorted sugar plums
- 6 " " " "

had disappeared on the 1st of January. It is true that we must allow for their generosity as we also have to give away at least half of what we have so as not to be selfish.

The little ones say that in the next box some almonds would figure well, not too many though.

Well, good bye dear mother and father. Kiss every one at home and give them my best wishes "of a merry Christmas and a Happy New Year".

JOHN LAFARGE

College, Sunday, 25th May

Dear Father:

I have a headache today and as I do not know how to make it go, I am writing you a few lines to dissapate my illness. Louis received a letter from Maman dated Glen Cove, this morning. Thursday I went fishing with J. Knight and Silas Chatard and while the others amused themselves fishing, I caught a head ache which still lasts and has not ceased for three days. Add to that to have to walk four miles going and four miles coming back, as well as a brilliant Sun and you can guess how I felt Friday morning.

I am pleased that you approve of a Diary. It is already a week since I began it. The half Century Jubilee begins for us today and Louis and I count on gaining it. I get up now every morning at four o'clock in order to be able to review my Algebra and Greek courses. I find I can study better at that time. There are only ten who rise so early and we have the whole study hall to ourselves. Also we can learn our lessons walking under the trees on the terrace before the Building. It is so pleasant to wash in the fountain and in the open air, (This would be terrible in winter) like the mountaineers did in times gone by.

Now I have a request to make. (This is how I usually begin). It is this: As I do not know absolutely if Mr. Curry will be assigned to the first class in Latin and first class in Greek during the coming year and it is very difficult to ascertain this. I want to return here on the 14th of August (school begins the 15th) and stay up to the 1st of October then if I like the college I will stay or if not, I will leave it. That is what I would like to do. That is not very difficult is it?

And one other request is this. I have taken out a book from the Student's Library and I have misplaced it. Now it appears that they cannot find it, as the book has disappeared. By the rule I am obliged to replace it or give them the value. That is the reason why I would be happy if you would send me the money in a letter for I do not like to ask Mr. McClosky for it and that will probably amount to several dollars. I think, however, it will not cost over four dollars.

Please tell Maman when she sends the shirts to put a little box of Gillett's steel pens in the packet.

And now dear father I will finish my letter as soon we will hear the bell for dinner.

Your affectionate son,

JOHN.

EDITOR'S NOTE—It is interesting to note in these letters the early tendency of John LaFarge, Jr., toward that mental development with which in later years he was so fully equipped and the desire he had at this time to paint and to draw. It is also amusing to compare these letters with similar ones of today. Caps, shoes and skates are still being asked for. Lessons are still difficult to encompass and pride in accomplishments of school activity is little changed, but in all cases there is not such a delightful reflection of what home meant to the boys.

Two big volumes were published in 1911, "The Story of the Mountain, Mount St. Mary's College and Seminary," compiled by Mary M. Meline and Rev. Dr. Edward F. X. McSweeney. From their pages we can glean some further information of the people mentioned in these letters. The President of the college then was Rev. Dr. John McCaffrey, who served in that capacity from March, 1838 to August, 1872, and during that long term was one of the notable factors in the progress of the Church in the United States. He was a stern man, extremely positive and discipline during his régime was heroic. In fact, the school had a national reputation for that characteristic under Dr. McCaffrey and his assistant, Rev. John McCluskey, who succeeded him in office (1872-1880). There was a rule that silence should be observed in the ranks as the boys went to Mass at the College church and Professor Ernest Legard, one of the Faculty, tells this story about John LaFarge:

"One day the surplice of sleet covered every branch and branchlet of the forest, making one of the wondrous spectacles of the winter. The boys were ascending the hill to Mass. 'O, look!' cried the young genius to his companion. He was reported for breaking the inflexible rule of silence. Father McMurdie pleaded for the boy-artist with his eye for color. 'Sir, would you excuse a breach of discipline?' was the reply of Dr. McCaffrey." And the penalty was inflicted.

The Professor Henry Dielman mentioned was the instructor in music (1843-1883) there and at St. Joseph's Convent Academy nearby. He was the father of Frederic Dielman, the artist. Mother Seton's grandsons, Dr. William Seton, Major Henry Seton, and Archbishop Robert Seton were Mountain students of this era.

John LaFarge's uncle, Louis B. Binsse, had been a student there

COMMENCEMENT.

MT. SAINT MARY'S COLLEGE,

JUNE 29th, 1853

GRAND MARCH, Dielman.
 ORATION ON CLASSIC STUDIES—JOHN F. KNIGHT, Havens.
 OVERTURE—LA DAME BLANCHE, Boldieu.
 ORATION ON SOCIALISM—LUKE TIERMAN CHATARD, Baltimore.
 LA ROSE—FULL ORCHESTRA, Dielman.
 ORATION ON THE DOWNFALL OF PAGANISM—GEORGE S. HESS, Cumberland, Md.
 FEST MARCH, Gungl.
 ORATION ON DEMOCRACY AND DESPOTISM—SILAS M. CHATARD, Baltimore.
 MEDLEY OVERTURE, Dielman.
 ORATION ON PREJUDICE—JOHN F. LAFARGE, New York.
 GALLOPADE.

RECESS OF TEN MINUTES.

OVERTURE LODOISKA Krutzer.
 DISCOURSE BEFORE THE PHILOMATHIAN SOCIETY, by O. A. BROWNSON, Esq.
 LE LYS—FULL ORCHESTRA, Dielman.

CONFERRING OF DEGREES.

VALEDICTORY—JOHN F. KNIGHT, Havens.
 SEPTET—Arranged by Dielman.

DISTRIBUTION OF PREMIUMS.

FINALE—FULL ORCHESTRA.

The Music by the St. Cecilia Society of Mt. St. Mary's College.

THE EXERCISES WILL COMMENCE AT 8¼ A. M.

The audience are requested not to leave their seats, except during the Recess.

Hodan & O'Brien, Printers and Stationers, 63 Baltimore st., Balto.

before him when the President was Rev. John Baptist Purcell, later Archbishop of Cincinnati. Writing to Dr. Purcell from New York, on July 27, 1831, Mr. Louis F. Binsse said:

"I hope to have the pleasure of seeing you then and of talking with you on a subject which interests me more than any other: *and that is the education of my son*. It would have been easy, doubtless, for me to have him make his classical studies at the New York College, but independently of the chaos of studies which is there pursued, what I fear most is the frightful anti-Catholic doctrine with which their lectures and their books are in some sort impregnated. I think little of science if religion does not keep step with it, or rather I do not believe there can be true science without true religion.

"I am the brother of M. Binsse de St. Victor, a well-known writer of the Catholic party in France, and the intimate friend of the Abbé F. de la Mennais; but by a singular awkwardness, my brother has always in Europe signed himself by the last part of his name and I here of the first."

For many years to the time of his death in 1895 Mr. Louis B. Binsse was one of the leading, influential and most aggressive Catholic laymen in New York. Pope Pius IX appointed him Consul-General of the Papal States in July, 1850 and he was the last man to hold that office.

There were six members of the LaFarge family on the college roll when John LaFarge was graduated with the Class of 1853.

The program of the Commencement shows what an interesting function it must have been, starting at half-past eight o'clock in the morning. He was one of the orators of the occasion, his subject being "Prejudice." Another was Silas M. Chatard, of the Baltimore family, future Rector of the North American College, Rome, and Bishop of Vincennes. The great philosopher and essayist, Orestes A. Brownson, delivered a "Discourse Before the Philomathic Society," before the conferring of the Degrees. No doubt it was most learned and entertaining and took the place of what we call now "Address to the Graduates." His theme was the advantage to be derived from liberal studies and there could probably be no better example of this than the subsequent career of John LaFarge.

T. F. M.

SOME RECORDS OF THE LAFARGE FAMILY

BY THOMAS F. MEEHAN

The LaFarge family and its connections appear frequently in the records of the constructive era of the Church in New York. The founder, John Frederic de la Farge, was born in 1786, at Bus-sac, Charente Inférieure, France. He served in both the army and the navy and was in San Domingo in 1802, escaping from there in 1806, when the Christophe rebellion made him, and so many others, exiles. He landed penniless in Philadelphia. Fortune smiled, however, on his energy and industry and he soon acquired wealth as a shipping merchant and banker, his connections being mainly with France. In accordance with democratic ideas he dropped the de and became plain LaFarge.

After the Revolution the State of New York undertook to open up the old Indian tribal lands to settlers, and this brought about speculation and exploiting by adroit manipulators, much the same as we see being done to-day by the development companies who turn suburban farms into city lots at big profits. With the Indian lands in Jefferson and Lewis Counties, which belonged to the Oneidas, much of this exploiting was done abroad. Gouveneur Morris, for instance, was largely instrumental in organizing what was known as the Antwerp Company, which took 680,000 florins of the savings of the simple Dutch people for 450,000 acres of this then wilderness. Of course the investors lost their money. Among the New York speculators were such well-known men of the last century as Francis Depau—who built the famous “Depau Row” in Bleeker Street, where the Mills Hotel now stands. He owned the most popular line of packet ships to Havre and was married to Sylvie de Grasse, daughter of Admiral de Grasse, of our French allies. Others were Herman Le Roy, William Bayard and James McEvers. In January, 1796, they acquired the section of the Oneida lands known as Penet’s Square.

French capital was also interested in this Black River country as early as 1760. In 1793 Louis Chassanis purchased 800,000

acres there with the intention of selling it in small farms to the refugees who were being driven from France by the excesses and ruin brought about by the Revolution. Along the St. Lawrence, and in this section these emigrés were expected to find congenial homes. Here came, 1805, from France, James LeRay de Chaumont, Franklin's friend and chief sponsor in Paris, (see *RECORDS AND STUDIES*, Vol. XV., March, 1921) and invested some of the money he brought with him, settling down to live in princely feudal style in the part of the county called the township of Orleans, and in his honor soon subtitled Leraysville, about ten miles east of Watertown. In 1808 he commenced to build the finest mansion west of the Hudson, a stone building 60 by 60, so lavish in its appointments that it was not completed until 1827. He used to drive about the country in a four-horse coach with postillons and outriders.

Other French investors attracted there by him were Joseph Bonaparte, the ex-king of Spain, then living here as the Count de Survilliers, the Duc de Vincennes, Marshal Grouchy of Waterloo fame. Murat's son Joachim, Count Réal, who was Napoleon's Chief of Paris police, and John F. LaFarge. Joseph Bonaparte, in exchange for diamonds, said to belong to the crown-jewels of Spain, and valued at \$120,000, got 150,000 acres of the Antwerp Company property in 1818 and built a mansion on it. Joachim Murat started the first grist mill in the section, but as the clearing of the land dried up his water power, the mill failed to work. The others were located in more or less splendor throughout the town of Orleans and at Cape Vincent until the restoration of Napoleon and political changes in France drew them back there. The opening of the Erie Canal so altered New York conditions that James LeRay failed in 1825, and lost most of his property. He returned to France in 1836 and died there in his eightieth year, on December 31, 1840.

In addition to his original purchase, John LaFarge invested largely in the Joseph Bonaparte property and settled down to live there. In 1823 the name of this precise spot, which had up to then been known as "Log Mills," was changed to LaFargeville, to honor him and he built there a mansion the extant picture of which shows it as an attractive three-story colonial building, with two substantial wings, one of which was used as a land office.

"The most noted historical landmark in the town of Orleans," says Haddock, in his "History of Jefferson County, New York, from 1793-1894," "is the old LaFarge mansion, about a mile south of the village. In its day this was a most elaborate structure, in its general appearance, much like the chateaux erected by all the wealthy French settlers in Jefferson and Lewis Counties. The dwelling was richly furnished throughout, and the great land-holding merchant of Havre occupied it in princely style, entertaining royally."

But the charm of the Jefferson County wilderness waned and, in 1840, John LaFarge moved his family to New York City. He had married a daughter of M. Binsse de St. Victor, a wealthy planter of San Domingo, who had also come to New York. Mr. LaFarge lived at 22 Washington Place and made numerous profitable investments in real estate in various sections of the city, as the references in the letters to his son given in the preceding pages show. He also owned the LaFarge House, which was long one of the city's leading hotels. It was located opposite Bond Street on the west side of Broadway, adjoining the Tripler Hall, mentioned in the foregoing letters. Both were destroyed by a fire in 1854. On the site was then built the New York Theatre and Metropolitan Opera House which opened on September 18, 1854. Here Rachel made her first American appearance, September 3, 1855. Laura Keane, Burton and Edwin Booth were among the stars that followed. In September 1859 the name was again changed to the Winter Garden. There Edwin Booth made his famous run of one hundred nights in "Hamlet." Fire again destroyed the building and the Grand Central Hotel was built on the plot.

Mr. LaFarge's constant business connections with France maintained necessarily a French atmosphere in his household and French was almost entirely spoken by himself and his boys. Their correspondence also was mainly in the same tongue. His home life and surroundings were typical of a large self-contained French family.

The establishment of a French Catholic congregation enlisted his active co-operation when Mgr. Forbin-Janson, Bishop of Nancy, then visiting the United States, began that movement in April, 1841. On May 2 of that year Mr. LaFarge, as treasurer

of the committee, bought for \$28,000 four lots on the north side of Canal Street, east of Broadway, on which the Protestant Church of the Annunciation, recently burned down, had stood. He advanced himself \$22,000 of the purchase money. The church built on this plot was dedicated by Bishop Hughes, August 21, 1842, under the patronage of St. Vincent de Paul. It is interesting to note, in view of the important and far-reaching work Mr. LaFarge's grandson, Rev. John LaFarge, S. J., has been doing in behalf of Colored Catholics, that the St. Ann Society, the first Negro mission in New York, was established in this church in 1843 by the pastor, Father Lafont, and continued to care for the spiritual instruction of the Colored Catholics of New York until the founding of their special church of St. Benedict the Moor in 1883.

John LaFarge died at his summer residence, Glen Cove, Long Island, New York, in 1858. After the seminary building at Nyack was burned down in 1838 he offered his Jefferson County mansion to Bishop Dubois as a new location for that institution and the Bishop accepted it. Bishop Hughes, the coadjutor and Administrator of New York, writing to his friend, Mark Frenaye of Philadelphia, May 3, 1838, said:

"I have been absent at Lafargeville, where I was induced to accept a tempting offer of a tempting place, viz, a plantation highly improved of 460 acres excellent limestone land, with buildings in quality superior and in extent not much inferior to Mount St. Mary's at Emmitsburg. The buildings were put up in 1834 and 1835 and cost \$30,000. The land itself would sell for 35 to 40 dollars an acre and the whole has been purchased for \$20,000, to be paid at intervals in ten years. . . . The farm and farmhouse with barns &c are rented, except forty acres, the most improved which is attached to the mansion. This was built and arranged by Mr. LaFarge for his own residence, but he is grown so rich that he wishes to come to the city and gives it so low in the hope that his improvements may be preserved and perfected in this way." (Hassard, "Life of Most Rev. John Hughes.")

The furniture and appurtenances were presented to Bishop Hughes by Mrs. LaFarge. The transfer of the property was made March 1, 1838.

Here, on September 20, 1838, the Seminary and College of

St. Vincent de Paul was opened, with the Rev. Francis Guth as president, and Fathers Moran, Haes, and three lay tutors as his assistants. In theory the location was admirable; in practice, impossible. It could be reached only after several days of weary travel. There were eight students at the opening, and the next year saw no increase. "Yesterday we opened our class again with a handful of children," wrote Father Guth, in September, 1839. "We might be compared to a big stage coach, drawn by four horses, but with no passengers." So it was evident that the LaFarge place would not do; St. Vincent's was closed, and the idea of locating there given up and the Seminary was transferred to Fordham in the autumn of 1841.

In his will made November 13, 1850, Archbishop Hughes left the property to his brothers, Michael Hughes of Chambersburg, Pennsylvania, and Patrick Hughes of LaFargeville.

LaFargeville is a village, 18 miles from Watertown; 197 from Albany and 339 from New York. What could have induced Bishop Dubois to select such a remote site for his seminary in 1838? The records include a curious chapter in the ecclesiastical history of New York. The pastor now of St. John's Church, LaFargeville, the Rev. Ralph A. Hoffman, was asked, for the purpose of this article, to give some particulars of the present condition of the old LaFarge mansion and of the progress of the village since the Seminary was abandoned. Under date of January 7, 1928, he answered:

"All that remains at present is the wing to the right as you face the house. The rest of the building has been torn down. The wing that remains is now used as a farm house and is only fairly kept up.

"About 1880 Michael Hughes, the nephew of Archbishop John Hughes, and the last Hughes to live in the old Seminary left the old mansion and went to California where he died about five years ago. The widow of Patrick Hughes, another nephew, still lives in this parish at the age of seventy-seven. One part of the farm, 150 acres, was sold by Patrick Hughes to Sam Snell and George Wilder, neighboring farmers. This place was a part of the old mansion property on the east side of the highway across the road from it. The property on the west side of the road was divided. About 100 acres were sold to George Baltz whose son now owns this property. The remaining part, about 114 acres, with the old mansion, was sold to George Wilder,

who left it to his nephew's wife, Mrs. Eugene Wilder. This descended to her daughter, Mrs. Fred Lehr of Philadelphia, New York, who sold it to the present owner, Mr. James Haggart, who occupies the farmhouse as I have described it.

"As to the progress of LaFargeville since the Seminary was abandoned, I may say it has been the usual story of rural districts. Financially and temporally the country has had, it seems, its best days. The land is not as productive as it was once. The new ways of living have played havoc with its inhabitants and the country is on the decline.

"Spiritually this section has been badly hit. Some of the German families fell away from the Faith through lack of priests and their descendants are now either Methodists or nothing. The better Irish families have departed for other locations. The young people drift to the cities in search of work and pleasure. The birth rate among those who are left is very small. Mixed marriages have badly undermined the Faith of the few who are left, so that the Catholic parish of LaFargeville to which John LaFarge and Louisa, his wife, in 1838 gave two acres of land for the purposes of a church, which was built in 1849, is dragging out a very lean existence. The village and country round about is overwhelmingly Protestant (mostly Methodist) and anti-Catholic. The Ku Klux Klan and kindred organizations, Odd Fellows and Masons have great influence, in consequence of which a Catholic is tolerated and pitied. We have no way of getting any converts except through marriage, as it is a sign of mental weakness to go near a Catholic church or give much attention to its claims. Such is the condition of this section at the present day."

Among the members of New York's French Colony was another exile, Victor Bancel, who in 1801 founded a famous local school in Harrison Street. In 1813, when the *l'École Économique* another fashionable educational institution, started under the auspices of Napoleon's general, Victor Moreau, the Baron Jean Guillaume Hyde de Neuville, Bishop Cheverus and others, some years before, was about to be given up because of the return of its sponsors to France, it was taken over and incorporated with his own school by M. Bancel. Its classes occupied a large building with spacious grounds on Anthony (now Worth) Street. M. Bancel's sister was married to M. Binsse de St. Victor, who also came to New York from San Domingo, and their daughter Louisa became John F. LaFarge's wife. The John LaFarge who wrote the foregoing letters from Emmitsburg was their son, born in New York in 1835. When he died at Providence,

R. I., in his seventy-sixth year, on November 14, 1910, there was a chorus of public adulation of him as a remarkable man, notable both as an artist and as a writer on the philosophy and history of art. The *Catholic World* of December, 1910, said: "Essentially a Catholic type, of universal expansiveness of perception, thought, and sympathy, he painted everything and anything, investing it with beauty, by reason of depth and breadth of vision of his profound simplicity and sincerity. Like Francis Thompson, his work is the varied expression of poet, mystic and metaphysician, of a man of the hour, a man of all ages, of a child whose soul is as old as the world."

In the appreciation printed by the New York *Evening Post* it was stated: "As a prophet his quality was peculiar. . . . He accepted the world blandly and with shrewd sagacity, somewhat in the spirit of those Jesuit Fathers from whom he received his first instruction. He represented to us the mellowness of the Catholic civilization of Europe."

The Boston *Transcript* said of him: "It was in his glass work that he most freely and completely expressed himself. This work is *sui generis*. In it he attained the perfect union of the decorative and the religious intention. Solemnity and exaltation are embodied in resplendent terms of color. . . . LaFarge has achieved what amounts almost to a miracle in carrying forward and giving new lustre to the sublime color of the old French glassmakers. Words are inadequate to describe the magnificence of his windows."

In *Outre-Mer*, Paul Bourget wrote: "Nowhere have I felt more keenly the influence of travel upon American intellectuality than in New York, and in the studio of the remarkable painter, John LaFarge. . . . He has invented new processes for stained glass. He has practised both decoration and illustration, painting in oil and encaustic, has executed large altar pieces, such as his grand refined Ascension, as well as delicate palettes."

The judge at the Paris Exposition of 1889 who awarded John LaFarge the Legion of Honor for his exhibit declared: "He is the great innovator, the inventor of opaline glass. He has created in all its details an art unknown before, an entirely new industry."

Among the notable examples of his art in this direction were the Battle Window at Harvard; the Peacock Window at the Worcester Art Museum and windows for the church of the Paulist Fathers at New York. His mural decorations included those at Trinity Church, Boston; the churches of St. Paul the Apostle, St. Thomas, the Ascension and the Incarnation, New York; the State Capitol, at St. Paul, Minnesota, and the Supreme Court Building, Baltimore. His published writings spread over a wide field, had, among others, these topics: "The American Art of Glass," "Considerations on Painting," "An Artist's Letters from Japan," "The Great Masters," "The Higher Life in Art," "One Hundred Great Masterpieces," "The Christian Story in Art."

It was his grandfather Binsse who gave him his first lessons in drawing and an Irish Jesuit aroused his interest in China and Japan that later found such effective expression in his decorative work. He was a pioneer in the study of the Japanese influence in art. His studies at Emmitsburg were not continuous. They were broken by attendance at St. John's College, Fordham, for a while. Then he went back to Emmitsburg, where he was graduated in 1853. It was there that his interest in art was aroused under the stimulation of a reading of Ruskin given him to study by one of his teachers. He went to Paris and had the benefit of a stay in the studio of Couture, thence to return to his native land and the development of a great artist and a great personality. In 1861 he married Miss Margaret Perry of Newport, a granddaughter of Commodore Perry of the United States Navy and a great-granddaughter of Benjamin Franklin. Their youngest son, the Rev. John LaFarge, S.J., was the celebrant of the Requiem Mass at his father's funeral from St. Francis Xavier's Church, New York, November 17, 1910.

TALES OF OLD NEW YORK

BY THOMAS F. MEEHAN

I

THE FIRST CATHOLIC OFFICE HOLDER

The first New York Catholic voted into an elective public office was Andrew Morris, who, in 1802, was chosen as Assistant Alderman for the First Ward of New York City. This was the lower end of Manhattan Island, the site of the pioneer settlement of New York State. In 1802 "all the wealth, aristocracy and dignity lived in the First Ward and it was an honor to be its Alderman," says Barrett in his "Old Merchants of New York." It has another special Catholic interest for it was there, in the autumn of 1643, that Blessed Isaac Jogues, after his rescue from his Mohawk captors, rested before he sailed for France. There, also in 1683, the Sacrifice of the Mass was offered for the first time in New York.

Andrew Morris began at the lowest rung of the political ladder. In the century since, other Catholics have ascended the higher steps, local, State, legislative, judicial, national. There remains but one, the highest, unattained. It was not easy then for a Catholic to become an office-holder. At the Convention which met in March, 1777, to frame the Constitution of the State of New York, John Jay, whose malevolent bigotry has made his name forever odious to the Catholics of New York, proposed that religious toleration be allowed to all mankind, "except the professors of the religion of the Church of Rome." Beaten in this he succeeded in having the thirty-sixth paragraph of the Constitution require a naturalized citizen to renounce and abjure allegiance and subjection "in all matters ecclesiastical and civil," to any person or State. This was also incorporated in the form of the official oath required by the laws of the State (revision of 1801, Chapter CXIII), an oath which, of course, no Catholic could take. It so remained until 1806, when the first Catholic and one of Andrew Morris' intimate associates, Francis Cooper,

was elected to the Assembly as a Democratic Republican. He refused to take the oath and a movement led by DeWitt Clinton compelled the legislature to pass a bill removing from the oath its objectionable features. Cooper served in the Assembly in the sessions of 1806-7-8-9-14 and -26. (Cf. RECORDS AND STUDIES, Vol. XII, June, 1918.)

Andrew Morris was a good citizen, worthy of any honor his fellows might pay him. He continued as Alderman until 1806, and is recorded as officiating at the laying of the cornerstone of the City Hall, May 26, 1803. In 1816 he was elected to the Assembly of the State Legislature. There are no records of any notable legislation connected with his name. His activities among his fellow Catholics of St. Peter's, the first congregation of the city, were constant, practical and effective, making him their trusted leader, and the friend and aid of Father Anthony Kohlmann, S. J., in organizing the diocese, and also of Bishop John Carroll of Baltimore.

He was born in Ireland in 1752 and probably came from Galway in 1785 with Dominick Lynch, or some time after Lynch had located in New York. The two men are closely associated in the current events of the period. The Morris family were among the historic "Fourteen Tribes," that in the Fifteenth century invaded the Connacht capital and thereafter disputed its ruling with the native Irishry. Morris must have had some fortune for he soon attained a local standing of importance in New York's commercial circles. He was a soap-maker and Chandler. The City Directory for 1789 locates him at 48 Great Dock street. Later he was at 22 Water street. It is also recorded that on August 10, 1797, he purchased a residence adjoining the Bowery property of Peter Stuyvesant for £640, and in 1815 was taxed for \$60,000 personal property. When the Bank for Savings, the first institution of its kind in New York was organized in 1819, he was chosen one of the Board of Directors. In 1822 he was made a director of the Mechanics Bank, now the Mechanics and Metals, branch of the Chase Bank.

St. Peter's, Barclay street, the mother church of New York State, was dedicated on November 4, 1786. In the organization of its congregation and in the administration of its affairs, Andrew Morris was constantly active. He was chosen a mem-

ber of the first Board of Trustees April 13, 1789, and in June following, was selected as head of the eight "gentlemen trustees," who "two and two should make the collection" and "sit in the seat apart for and called the trustees' pew." (Farley, "History of St. Patrick's Cathedral.") On March 30, 1800, he was on the parish committee of four to establish "a free school for the education of children." This is now the oldest free school in New York City. The first city public school was not opened until May 19, 1806. On January 6, 1806, as chairman of the general meeting of the Catholics of New York, he sent the petition to the Legislature that brought about the abolition of the anti-Catholic oath John Jay had put into the State laws. His name is on the old bell that was hung in the steeple of the original St. Peter's; he was the treasurer of the Building Committee that erected St. Patrick's (old) Cathedral and twice subscribed \$1,000 to the building fund and with Cornelius Heeney he took title to the present site of St. Patrick's, on Fifth avenue in 1810. The Lylburn mansion stood there and they bought it for Father Anthony Kohlmann, S. J., to be used as the New York Literary Institution, the first Catholic College in the city, and which thereafter was located there until 1813. In fact, no Catholic activity went on in those days in which Andrew Morris did not prominently participate. With Cornelius Heeney and Francis Cooper he seems to have held the continued and unqualified confidence and respect of the ecclesiastics who were the founders of the Church in New York. The names of these and other laymen then active appear in the later "Trustee" troubles. It is difficult now to properly understand all the details and complications of these deplorable incidents of the pioneer days.

In September, 1803, Bishop John Carroll made the trip from Baltimore to Boston to dedicate the old Franklin street Church of the Holy Cross for Father Matignon and the Bishop's friend, James Barry, was arranging the details for him. Writing to Barry from Baltimore, on August 25, the Bishop tells him he thinks the route he suggests might be inconvenient,

"on account of the Pontificalia necessary for the occasion and likewise the inconvenience of disposing of my horses; whereas by another route pointed out to me I shall avoid these disadvantages, I am advised to go to Hobueks ferry, two miles above

Powles Hook; to cross over in a boat always ready to the wharf of the new State prison and to follow the road to the two-mile stone, near which I and my horses will be provided for by Mr. Andrew Morris having his country house there. Hence he promises me a conveyance to some town on East River, where I shall find packets for Rhode Island and Providence."

"Hobueks Ferry" was the present city of Hoboken and "Powles Hook," what is now lower Jersey City. The "new State prison" was located where the Christopher street ferry to Hoboken lands on West street and some of its outbuildings are still standing there. Andrew Morris' country house at the "two-mile stone," the mark of the end of the second mile of the old Boston Post Road, was at what is now Third avenue, between Sixteenth and Seventeenth streets.

It cannot now be said that Bishop Carroll let Andrew Morris take care of him there, but he had a fine time in Boston, where the famous Ancient and Honorable Artillery made him their special guest at a grand banquet.

Andrew Morris married Ellinora Skinner of Baltimore. They had three children: Thomas, born April 29, 1791; died October 29, 1856; Margaret E., born 1792, and Ellinora, born January 30, 1793. They were all baptized at St. Peter's and Don Tomas Stoughton, Dominick Lynch's partner, was godfather for Ellinora. Margaret married Louis Willcocks and had fourteen children. Their daughter, Margaret Cecilia, married John Mathew Donald Mel de Fontenay and had ten children. One of them, Mrs. Cecilia Mel Porock, eighty-six years of age, was living (December, 1927) at Oakland, California, and proudly claimed that all that branch of the family had kept the Faith.

On December 9, 1811, Thomas Morris was married to Eliza Coles by Father B. Fenwick, S. J., at St. Peter's; a "mixed" with the usual results. Miss Coles was the daughter of John B. Coles, a wealthy flour merchant, who was the Alderman of the First Ward and one of Morris' neighbors there. They had six children and lived in affluence at 117 Waverly Place and 64 Fifth avenue. Thomas did not inherit the sturdy Catholic character of his father for he allowed his non-Catholic wife to bring up their children outside the Church. By the irony of fate, they and their descendants have been identified with the fashionable St.

Thomas' Protestant Episcopal congregation of the West Side on Fifth avenue just above the site their grandfather bought for New York's first Catholic College and later the location of St. Patrick's Cathedral. There is now no Catholic Morris, and the last of the name, Benjamin Coles Morris, Thomas Morris' great grandson, has no child. Andrew Morris died at 627 Broadway on January 7, 1828. He was buried in old St. Patrick's but just where cannot today be determined. His descendants are nearly all in the non-Catholic Greenwood Cemetery, Brooklyn. Their identity is lost through non-Catholic marriages into the Coles, Lawrence, Luqueer, Hollins, Chaplin and Gittings families. The family fortune also has disappeared.

II

GRAND OPERA'S PIONEER PATRON

In the evolution of time the center of the musical world has finally gravitated to New York. From all countries of the globe the greatest artists, vocal and instrumental, wend their way to this hospitable auditorium where fortune follows successful professional triumph. The patronage of the Metropolitan Opera House, the apex of the pyramid, was never so numerous; the concert list was never so crowded with programs of the highest and most attractive class; the individual artists of all kinds never were so conspicuous and versatile.

In all this glory and glitter few now know or recall, that the foundation of it was laid in April, 1825, by two men, an Irish-American and an Italian, types of the two races that are now so prominent in whatever goes to make up the nation's progress, political, social and commercial. These two were Dominick Lynch, Jr., and Lorenzo Da Ponte. The first was the son of Dominick Lynch, an Irish merchant, who came here from Galway in 1785; the other an Italian poet and adventurer and, sad to say, an unworthy priest over whose personal career it is best to draw the charitable veil of silence.

His greatest claim to remembrance is his connection with Mozart, for whom he composed the libretti for those immortal treasures, "*Le Nozze di Figaro*," "*Don Giovanni*" and "*Così fan tutte*." He was a writer of uncommon ability, and a successful teacher. Theodore W. Koch describes him as "The Man to whom credit is due for being the first in America to direct attention to the beauties of Italian literature, and expound Dante to an American audience." And his latest biographer, Dr. Joseph L. Russo, of Columbia University, where Da Ponte taught his classes, declares that "The appointment of Da Ponte [as a professor at Columbia] crowned a teaching career of nearly twenty years, during which no less than two thousand American students had learned from him the beauties of the Italian language and acquired a first-hand appreciation of its world-famous authors,

from Dante and Petrarch down to that young legion of writers and poets with whom the movement of the Risorgimento had its inception."

Da Ponte died of old age, at No. 91 Spring Street, New York, on August 17, 1838, and was buried in an unmarked grave in the Old Cathedral Cemetery that once occupied the block in Eleventh Street, between First Avenue and Avenue A. All traces of his remains are therefore lost forever, but from the details recording his funeral it may be inferred that he made his spiritual peace before the end came of his stormy and erratic career. Henry T. Tuckerm, who was an eye-witness, thus describes the burial in an article he wrote for *Putnam's Magazine* in 1868:

"The obsequies of Da Ponte were impressive. The funeral took place at noon of the 20th of August, 1838. Allegri's *Miserere* was performed over his remains at the Cathedral. The pallbearers were his countryman, Maroncelli, the companion of Pelli-co's memorable imprisonment at Spielberg; his old friend Clement C. Moore, and two eminent citizens, the Hon. Julian C. Verplank and Dr. Macneven. On the coffin was a laurel wreath, and before it, on the way from the church to the Roman cemetery in Second Avenue, whither he was borne—followed by a long train of mourners led by the officiating priests and the attendant physician."

This physician was the famous Dr. John W. Francis, to whose pen we are now indebted for so many graphic pictures of old New York, and the priests at St. Patrick's Cathedral then were Rev. John D. Urquhart, Rev. William Starrs, and Rev. John Conroy (later Bishop of Albany). Bishop John Hughes had recently come from Philadelphia, having been consecrated in St. Patrick's, on January 9, 1838, as coadjutor to the paralyzed Bishop Dubois. "All of his [Da Ponte's] biographers," says Dr. Russo, "agree that he died in the Catholic Faith, and a number of letters published by Marchesan confirm this statement beyond doubt."

The Church, ever the foster-mother of the arts and sciences, supplied the first impulses to musical culture. In a relative sense it was what happened in New York, where psalmody occasioned much controversy among the Protestant congregations. Old Trin-

ity set up the first organ in America, and there Handel's "Messiah" was given for the first time on this side of the Atlantic, on January 9, 1770. In September, 1823, a choral society was organized, which met in the lecture-room of St. George's church in Beekman Street, and gave its first concert there April 20, 1824. Dominick Lynch, Jr., was then in the prime of a vigorous manhood. As has been stated his father was a merchant who settled in New York in June, 1785, and after Charles Carroll, was the richest Catholic in the United States. He lived at No. 36 Broadway in the row of imposing residences that once also housed George Washington, and the Minister from Spain, Don Diego Gardoqui. He sent his son Dominick, Jr., to Georgetown College where the boy was one of the earliest students, and when he had finished his course he returned to New York and became like his father a successful merchant and a leader in local, religious, social and commercial activities.

Travel abroad had given him an insight into the delights of polite culture, especially in music, for which he had a great natural inclination. Having ample means to gratify his tastes in this direction he was with Philip Hone recognized as an arbiter of social events and customs. Hone was another wealthy retired merchant whose splendid house at No. 235 Broadway, where the Woolworth Building now stands, was, for a generation, a center of social activity. He was mayor of the city and at the end of his term in 1827 began to keep a "Diary," two volumes of which were published in 1889, and recently (1927) revised and reissued. The "Diary" is now looked to, when anyone wishes details of what went on in New York for almost the first half of the last century. Dominick Lynch's name constantly occurs throughout its pages and when he died in Paris, July 31, 1837, Hone wrote of him:

"How many happy hours I have passed in his society! No man ever has even contributed so much to the refined enjoyment of the circle in which he moved. He sang and played beautifully, was the ornament of female society and infused spirit and joviality into the dinner parties of his male friends where he was a constant and favored guest. . . . We are indebted to him for the introduction of the Italian opera and the inimitable Signorina Garcia, and her father and family came to New York under his

auspices. He was also the master-spirit who established and conducted the musical soirées a few years since—the most refined entertainment we have ever had.”

In the same reminiscent vein, Dr. John M. Francis refers to him in his “Old New York” as “the acknowledged head of the fashionable and festive board, a gentleman of the *bon ton* and a melodist of great powers and of exquisite taste.”

In his “Old Merchants of New York,” Walter Barrett says: “One of the most extraordinary men of his day was Dominick Lynch. . . . He was a perfect gentleman, and thirty-two years ago, was the envy of all the ambitious youths of New York. Whatever Dominick Lynch said was ‘good’ must have been. He was the most fashionable man in New York.”

Another tribute, though from a negative angle, is given him in the “Journal” of the English actress, Fanny Kemble, who paid a visit to New York in 1835, and after her return to London, had the bad manners, like others of her countrymen and women, to ridicule the hospitable people who entertained her here. Among these were the Hones who introduced the Kembles at an elaborate dinner party on the evening of September 15, 1835. Dominick Lynch was one of the guests and this is what Fanny Kemble says of him in the “Journal,” among the impertinent and ill-bred comments she makes on the social function Mr. and Mrs. Hone arranged in her honor:

“There was a Mr. —, the Magnus Apollo of New York, who is a musical genius, sings as well as any gentleman could sing, pronounces Italian well, and accompanies himself without false chords, all of which renders him the man round whom . . . the women listen and languish. . . . After dinner we had coffee but no tea, whereat my English stomach was in high dudgeon. The gentlemen did not sit long and when they joined us Mr. —, as I said before, uttered sweet sounds. By the bye I was not a little amused at Mrs. — [her hostess] asking me whether I had heard of his singing or their musical soirées, and seeming all but surprised that I had no revelations of either across the Atlantic.”

While abroad Dominick Lynch, of course, had the opportunity of listening to performances of Italian operas, and he determined

that New York should enjoy the advantages of a similar musical attraction. Accordingly he arranged with Manuel Garcia, a Spanish impresario then in London, to come to New York for a season of Italian opera with his company. Garcia was a famous tenor, and his daughter, Maria Felicita, was the star of the company. She was later better known as Madame Malibran, one of the great singers of her era. As in the career of Adelina Patti, who followed her, to New York belongs the honor of having bestowed on Malibran her earliest laurels. Dominick Lynch brought the Garcia troupe across the Atlantic in one of his own ships. A contributor writing several years ago in the *New York Sun* said of this:

"The Garcia family were heard of by Mr. Dominick Lynch in Europe, and he, like the ardent amateur that he was, brought the whole family over in one of his packet ships. The Garcias were entertained by Mr. Lynch and the greatest of prima donnas, Maria Garcia (later Malibran) made her first sojourn in America in the Lynch mansion. I had the pleasure of hearing Mrs. Luqueer (who was Mr. Lynch's daughter) narrate some experiences with the gifted genius of sixteen who had on her arrival received a score in the then new opera of 'Otello' by Rossini. It was in his second style and a great novelty, no doubt, to the young exponent of 'Il Barbiere,' and the more highly florid operas of that date. At all events while Miss Lynch was in the morning room seated at work, and while the younger singer was at the piano testing the part of Desdemona, Maria Garcia would watch the effect on the face of the hearer. If the emotion manifested was so deep that Miss Lynch had to stop sewing, Maria knew that her creation was taking proper form for its public hearing, and she went over her part until she was perfect in it."

Dominick Lynch was one of the financial backers of the Park Theatre, New York's leading playhouse that stood about 200 feet east of Ann Street in Park Row. Here on the night of November 29, 1825, the Garcia troupe gave the first performance of Italian opera ever heard in the United States. The opera was Rossini's "Il Barbiere di Siviglia" in which Maria Felicita sang Rosina and Garcia himself appeared as Almaviva. Da Ponte was in the audience which also included the ex-king of Spain, Joseph Bonaparte,

the Lynches, the Hones, Fenimore Cooper, Fitz-Greene Halleck and the social elect of New York. This opera season lasted until September 30, 1826, during which the company gave seventy-six performances at the Park and Bowery theaters, the largest receipts for one performance being \$2,980 and the smallest \$250. The prices of seats were: boxes, \$2; pit, \$1; gallery, 25 cents.

During the stay of the Garcias in New York Felicity was married at old St. Peter's in Barclay Street to a merchant named Francis Eugene Louis Malibran, and there in the Marriage Register (March 23) can still be seen the name of Dominick Lynch, signed as one of the witnesses with those of two other Catholic merchants prominent in those days, Peter Harmony and John B. Lasala. The marriage turned out most unhappily.

Another interesting incident of the season was an oratorio given by the Garcia company at St. Patrick's Cathedral on the afternoon of June 22, 1826, for the benefit of the Orphan Asylum which was then just beginning its formal development of the charitable work that has gone on for more than a century. This was a great Catholic and social event, as we learn from the files of the *Truth Teller*, at that time New York's Catholic weekly paper. The tickets cost two dollars, admitting one gentleman and one lady "or two ladies, thereby accommodating the female members of families desirous of attending." We have it on the report of the *Truth Teller* that the entertainment

"went off in a most brilliant and impressive manner. The united attractions of musical science and the feelings of charity brought together, we are happy to say, a crowded and fashionable audience. In addition to a numerous body of the Catholics of this city, there were many of almost every persuasion, as well as strangers who are now visiting New York. . . . The numbers present on Thursday last we should suppose to amount to two thousand three hundred persons, and the amount of receipts we presume will be about \$2,500."

One of the results of the oratorio was, as has happened after "Grand Concerts" in other churches, that the regular choir of the Cathedral broke up in a grand row. They resigned in a body because they considered they had been slighted by the committee in charge of the benefit. It took several weeks to bring them back

to the choir loft during which an acrimonious controversy raged in the *Truth Teller's* columns.

Manuel Garcia, Jr., who sang with his father and sister in this concert, and at the first opera performance, lived to be a hundred and one years old, dying in London in 1905. He was the most illustrious teacher of singing in the nineteenth century, the first to engage in a scientific inquiry into the confirmation of the vocal organs during which he invented the laryngoscope. Jenny Lind was one of his pupils. His other sister, Pauline, as Madame Viardot, also became a great singer. She was a contralto. The father of this gifted family, Manuel del Popolo Garcia, began his career as a chorister in the cathedral of his native Seville, at the age of six, in 1781. He was the author of 17 Spanish, 19 Italian, and 7 French operas. Rossini wrote *Almaviva* in "*Il Barbiere*," expressly for him. It was in this character that he first appeared in New York, and it was Dominick Lynch who brought all these fine artists to this country.

Da Ponte persuaded Garcia to include Mozart's "*Don Giovanni*," for which he had written the libretto, in the season's repertoire, and it was given, with great success, on the evening of May 23, 1826, and repeated three times. After the Garcia troupe returned to Europe Da Ponte thought he might try an opera season in New York also, and with a French tenor named Montrésor, who brought a company from Europe, they began an engagement at the Richmond Hill theater, in 1832, which failed after thirty-five performances. Nothing daunted by this he got a number of music lovers to finance the erection of our first Italian Opera House, at the corner of Church and Leonard Streets. It had an auditorium "magnificently decorated, rivaling in luxury and good taste the foremost European playhouses" and the "stage settings were gorgeous and the seats large and comfortable." Here on the evening of November 18, 1833, under the most fashionable social auspices he began with Signor Riva-Finola as director, and Maestro Salvioli as leader of the orchestra, another season which lasted for twenty-eight performances in New York and fifteen in Philadelphia. Then it failed and he lost control of the opera house.

This is the story of the beginning of Italian opera in the United

States; and these were the men who were the pioneers in that field of social and musical activities that have led up to New York's monumental accomplishment—the Metropolitan Opera House and its phenomenal company.

III

A CATHOLIC NOTE ON POE'S "RAVEN"

In the very interesting and valuable collection of autograph letters and historic manuscripts in the J. Pierpont Morgan Library, New York, is this letter written by Edgar Allan Poe:

Dear Shea:

Lest I should have made some mistake in the hurry I transcribe the whole alteration.

Instead of the whole stanza commencing "Wondering at the stillness broken," etc.—substitute this—

Startled at the stillness broken by reply so aptly spoken,
"Doubtless," said I, "what it utters is its only stock and store
Caught from some unhappy master whom unmerciful Disaster
Followed fast and followed faster till his songs one burden bore—
Till the dirges of his hope the melancholy burden bore,
'Nevermore—ah, nevermore!'"

At the close of the stanza preceding this, instead of "Quoth the raven Nevermore," substitute *Then the bird said "Nevermore."*
Truly yours, POE.

This missive, which was folded, according to the custom of the day, and addressed: "J. Augustus Shea, Esq., to be delivered as soon as he comes in," was sent by Poe to his friend John Augustus Shea, one of the leaders of the Catholic literary circle of the New York of the thirties and forties. It indicates a change to be made in the text of the famous "Raven."

Poe came to New York in January, 1837, and went to board at 13½ Carmine Street, which is in the heart of Greenwich Village, but left for Philadelphia the following April. He came back to New York in April, 1844, going to live with his wife at 130 Greenwich Street. During his short career as a cadet at the West Point Military Academy, Poe met Shea, who was then a clerk there in the Commissary's office. Their friendship was continued in New York and from this, and other evidence, it seems that the association was intimate all during Poe's stay in the city.

The Catholic literary organ of those days was, as its title-page runs: "The Catholic Expositor and Literary Magazine, a Monthly

Periodical, edited by the Very Reverend Felix Varela, D.D., and Rev. Charles Constantine Pise, D.D." and published at 151 Fulton Street. Constant contributors to its pages, in both prose and verse, were John Augustus Shea and his literary associate of that era, Charles James Cannon, names to conjure with then, but unknown to the present generation. Shea's son was the late Chief Justice George Shea of the old Marine (now City) Court, who inherited some of his father's literary ability as his life of Alexander Hamilton shows. One of Judge Shea's daughters was Mrs. Ballastier, the wife of Rudyard Kipling's brother-in-law. Unfortunately, as in the case of the descendants of so many other pioneer Catholic families, the second generation of Sheas were sheep who wandered outside the True Fold.

Poe's Catholic associates and friends in New York were numerous. From the Greenwich Street boarding house he went out into what was then the Bloomingdale suburbs. There he was received as a boarder with the family of Patrick Brennan, whose farm of some 200 acres covered this section of the west side extending from the present western boundary of Central Park to the North River. The New York Shakespeare Society has marked by a bronze tablet on the building at the northwest corner of Broadway and Eighty-fourth Street, the approximate site of the old Brennan farmhouse. It was during his residence there, 1843-1844, that Poe finished his poem "The Raven" and it was to Patrick Brennan's daughter Martha and her mother that he first read it when he had completed it, in the room he occupied, on the second floor of the house. Miss Brennan became the wife of the late General James R. O'Beirne of Civil War fame and one of the most distinguished of the alumni of old St. John's College, Fordham. She often, according to family tradition, told the story of hearing the first version of "The Raven" and of Poe's stay in the Bloomingdale farmhouse. It was his custom, she said, to wander away from it in pleasant weather to an immense rock on the bank of the Hudson and sit for hours silently gazing out over the waters.

As noted already the literary intimacy between Shea and Poe began at West Point. Judge Shea used to relate that his father often told how persistently he had encouraged the poet's youthful aspirations. The consultations as to the structure of "The Raven"

indicate that these relations were continued when Poe came to live in New York.

Shea and Poe and other kinspirits used to foregather in a resort called in the City Directory of that date "a refectory," kept by one "Sandy Welsh, in Nassau Street, near the corner of Ann Street. They evidently had been discussing the construction of "The Raven," for Poe sent the amendment set forth in his elegant, precise, copperplate writing, every letter meticulously formed, in the note of the Morgan collection to "Sandy's" refectory—"to be delivered as soon as he comes in," to Shea, who had undertaken the task of getting it published, in some one of the local prints under the pseudonym of "Quarles." Shea gave it to Colton's *American Review* in which it was printed in the issue for February, 1845. This first printing, however, was anticipated in the daily edition of the *New York Mirror* of January 29, 1845, and the poem was also given in the weekly edition of the *Mirror* of February 8, prefaced with this explanation: "We are permitted to copy (in advance of publication) from the 2d No. of the *American Review* the following remarkable poem by Edgar Poe."

Thence it went out all over the world to the immortality linked to the name of its gifted but ill-starred author.

Mrs. O'Beirne and her distinguished husband were not the only members of the Brennan family who became notable in New York Catholic records. Her brother was the famous "Big Tom" Brennan, for many years Commissioner of Charities and Corrections and a prominent figure in local charitable and philanthropic movements for more than a generation. He invented for Bellevue the emergency ambulance service for hospitals now so universal, but then unknown, during his official administration of that hospital, and largely aided the founding, by Sister Ireene of the Mount Saint Vincent Sisters of Charity, of New York's great Foundling Asylum, the first institution of its kind in the United States.

In 1846 Poe moved to Fordham to occupy the cottage in the Bronx to which his admirers now make pilgrimages, and where "Eureka," "Annabel Lee," "For Annie" and "Ulalume" were written. He was a constant visitor at St. John's College nearby and loved to wander about its spacious grounds. Father Doucet and Father Thébaud of the faculty were his special friends, in-

deed, everything about the historic Rose Hill manor seemed congenial and sympathetic to his harried soul. There are many traditions still at Fordham University of the delight he took in meeting the old Jesuits there who made him feel so perfectly at home and welcome and who could talk to him about the interests and the topics he took pleasure in discussing.

In his memoirs, the late Archbishop Robert Seton tells how, when he was a boy, his father often drove him over to Fordham from their country residence near Long Island Sound and that they would stop at Poe's cottage and chat with him. It was a lovely spot in those days, with a small rocky elevation crowned with cedars, overlooking a pleasant landscape with the hills of Long Island in the distance. In the old Fordham College annals, it is said of him:

"It was one of Poe's greatest gifts that he could make friends wherever he went. To see him was to love him. He had a charming presence, a most intellectual countenance, brilliant dark eyes, a high forehead, with the temples well developed, and a pale and sad expression of face that attracted people. His features were a trifle sharp and made up an almost typical American face. It was a pleasure to see him and still more to listen to him."

And that's what made him always a favorite guest among the Jesuit community at old St. John's College.

The only known autograph manuscript of Poe's poem, "The Raven," was sold, in May, 1927, by the family of Mrs. Edith D. Whitaker of Philadelphia to dealers who valued it at more than \$50,000. The manuscript had been in possession of the Whitaker family ever since Poe penned the copy and signed it to gratify the wishes of Dr. Samuel A. Whitaker, a college companion. Manuscript experts declare there is no other American literary document of comparable value outside libraries. Except for the one stanza of "The Raven," which is in the letter of Poe in the J. P. Morgan collection, as related, this is the only known manuscript of "The Raven" in the handwriting of Edgar Allen Poe. The manuscript is written on two double sheets, four pages, eight by ten inches, and the writing is beautifully legible in Poe's finest style. The poem is complete in its sixteen stanzas and is signed at the end "Edgar A. Poe." Poe was paid the paltry sum of \$10 for the poem by the editor of the *American Review* of New York.

The Raven

Once, upon a midnight dreary, while I pondered, weak and weary,
 Over many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore —
 While I nodded, nearly napping, suddenly there came a tapping,
 As of some one gently rapping, rapping at my chamber door.
 "Tis some visitor," I muttered, "tapping at my chamber door —
 Only this and nothing more."

And the Raven, never flitting, still is sitting — still is sitting
 On the pallid bust of Pallas just above my chamber door;
 And his eyes have all the seeming of a demon's that is dreaming,
 And the lamp-light o'er him streaming throws his shadow on the floor;
 And my soul from out that shadow that lies floating on the floor
 Shall be lifted — nevermore.

Edgar A. Poe.

Inscribed to Dr. S. A. Whitaker
 of Phenixville

The First and Last Stanzas of Poe's "The Raven"
 in the Author's Handwriting

IV

A FAMOUS LANDMARK PASSES

In the real estate sections of the New York papers of July 8, 1927, an item recorded in the transactions of the previous day forecasts the passing of one of New York's most historic Catholic landmarks. As given in the *Evening Post*—the other notices were practically the same—the statement ran:

"Further inroads have been made in the block opposite the home of J. P. Morgan by the interests whose leasing for eighty-four years of a large property at Madison Avenue, Thirty-sixth and Thirty-seventh Streets, was announced yesterday. . . . Yesterday's leasing deal involved the four-story building at 218 Madison Avenue, northwest corner of Thirty-sixth Street, the three adjoining buildings at 13 to 17 East Thirty-sixth Street, and the abutting four-story building at 14 East Thirty-seventh Street."

The house at 218 Madison Avenue, a typical New York four-story brown stone residence, was the house in which New York's first Archbishop, John Hughes, spent the last years of his career, and in which he died, on January 3, 1864.

In 1837, the Rev. John Hughes, then pastor of St. John's Church, Philadelphia, was appointed by the Holy See Coadjutor to Bishop Dubois of New York. Father Hughes came to New York on January 2, 1838, took up his residence in apartments provided for him in the rectory, No. 263 Mulberry Street, opposite St. Patrick's, and on January 7 he was consecrated in the old Cathedral titular Bishop of Basileopolis and Coadjutor to the Bishop of New York. It is not the purpose here to review the subsequent incidents of his remarkable and strenuous administration during the major part of which he continued to reside in Mulberry Street. His ceaseless exertions, however, told at last on his once vigorous constitution and his health, in 1856, was so impaired that he withdrew almost entirely from public effort.

For a desirable change the Cathedral trustees purchased a villa for him at Manhattanville, then an attractive country suburb, but he rarely went there. It was therefore sold and the house at the northwest corner of Thirty-sixth Street and Madison Avenue,

the No. 218 Madison Avenue that figures in the real estate transfer noted above, was bought.

The Archbishop moved uptown from Mulberry Street and spent there the last decade of his eventful life, his sister Mrs. William Rodrigue with her husband and children sharing the house with him. Mr. Rodrigue assisted James Renwick, the architect, in the supervision of the construction of St. Patrick's Cathedral, Fifth Avenue, work on which began in 1858, the cornerstone being laid on August 15 of that year. Messrs. Renwick and Rodrigue received salaries of \$2,500 a year for their services, and the contract price for the white Westchester marble for the building was \$850,000.

As stated, the house was a typical four-story New York residence with a stable in the rear. The Archbishop took the second floor for his study, sleeping room and private chapel. The top floor he made into a library containing about ten thousand books. He kept his office in the old Mulberry Street residence and went down there to transact all the diocesan business.

For the first five years in the Madison Avenue house he did some occasional entertaining at small dinner parties, but he seemed to have no domestic tastes and, although much attached to Mrs. Rodrigue and her family, seldom mingled with them. His evenings were spent alone reading, or playing a solitaire game of billiards. Newspapers and current periodicals formed the favorite material of his literary indulgence. He died of Bright's disease, and even thus early the debilitating effects of that dread malady were manifesting themselves. For nearly a year before his death he was unable to say Mass.

On his arrival at New York on August 12, 1862, from the diplomatic mission abroad, in the interest of the Union cause which had been entrusted to him by President Lincoln and Secretary of State Seward, his strength gave way very rapidly and for weeks he spent most of his time in bed and received no formal company. After the excitement of the trip wore off he sank into a sort of mental and bodily inertia from which only some of the most notable incidents of the Civil War, then raging, could rouse him. The death of Archbishop Kenrick, early in July, 1863, inspired a heroic effort to go to Baltimore for the funeral. There he tried to say a low Mass but he collapsed and had to be assisted from the altar.

When he returned to New York he found the city in a turmoil over the conscription ordered by the Government to fill the State's quota in the Union army. For some time previous the agitation of this move had occasioned a bitter public controversy, a popular impression being that conscription was only an effort to force into the army poor men or all those unable to offer the bounty for a substitute. During the week July 11-18, 1863, mob violence followed the debating of "the draft," and on July 14, Governor Horatio Seymour wrote Archbishop Hughes:

"Will you exert your powerful influence to stop the disorders now reigning in this city? I do not wish to ask anything inconsistent with your sacred duties; but if you can with propriety aid the civil authorities at this crisis I hope you will do so."

The Republican papers, especially Horace Greeley's *Tribune* and William Cullen Bryant's *Evening Post* teemed with tirades against Catholic and Irish Democrats. They charged the Archbishop and his "people" with being responsible for the calamity of the war, the priests especially, because they refused to preach abolition and anti-slavery doctrines from their pulpits. Archbishop Hughes answered these attacks and recalled his long and loyal services to the country, in a letter printed in the *Herald* of July 15. In a "postscript" to this missive he appealed "to all persons who love God and revere the holy Catholic religion" to "respect also the laws of man and the peace of society" and "to retire to their homes with as little delay as possible," and this appeal was printed in large type following the proclamations of the Governor and the Mayor commanding all good citizens to keep the peace.

The Archbishop also sent out a signed invitation, "To the men of New York who are now called in many papers 'Rioters,'" which was posted all over the city and printed in the papers as follows:

"Men, I am not able, owing to rheumatism in limbs, to visit you, but that is not a reason why you should not pay me a visit in your whole strength. Come then tomorrow, Friday, at two o'clock to my residence, northwest corner of Madison Avenue and Thirty-sixth Street. I shall have a speech prepared for you. There is abundant space for the meeting around my house. I can address you from the corner of the balcony. If I should be unable to stand during its delivery you will permit me to address you sit-

ting. My voice is much stronger than my limbs. I take upon myself the responsibility of assuring you that in paying me this visit, or, in returning from it, you shall not be disturbed by any exhibition of municipal or military presence. You are all Catholics, or as many of you as are, have a right to visit your Bishop without molestation."

Some five thousand persons appeared before the Archbishop's residence in answer to this. He came out on the balcony with Vicar-General Starrs and several other priests, but he was not able to stand up. Seated in a chair he made a long and rambling speech that plainly indicated the ravages his fatal malady had made on him mentally as well as physically. At the end he was much exhausted and the crowd peacefully dispersed after he had given them his blessing. It was his last public appearance. He traveled during August and September in a vain search for strength, and passed the next months in a state of almost entire prostration, his vitality steadily waning until the end came as the year closed.

This historic house on Madison Avenue, which now, like so many of its neighbors, goes into the hands of the wreckers, has not changed materially since the Civil War era. The balcony from which the Archbishop spoke was removed several years ago, and the broad front stoop, usual for all such houses, was cut away in 1926 when the roadway of the avenue was widened; otherwise the mansion was the same though sadly fallen from its once proud social standing.

This was the seventh official residence of the Bishops of New York. When the first to live here, Bishop Connolly, arrived in 1815 he established his residence at 211 Bowery. Thence he moved to the block in Broome Street, adjoining the home of ex-President James Monroe, which a patriotic appeal to preserve as a memorial was made in vain. Then the Bishop went to 512 Broadway where he died February 5, 1825. His successor, Bishop Dubois, in November, 1826, began his administration at 65 Murray Street, a nice residential street skirting the confines of the adjoining Columbia College grounds. In 1836 the house in Mulberry Street was purchased. Bishop Dubois moved into it from an establishment he had been occupying at Prince Street, corner of Crosby, and this Mulberry Street residence served until Archbishop Hughes went up to Madison Avenue.

After his death his successor, Archbishop McCloskey, had several houses before he also took up his residence at 218 Madison Avenue, where he remained until the new Cathedral and the two residences in its rear on the same avenue were completed in 1879.

An anti-Catholic calumny attributes to President Lincoln the assertion:

"I have the proof that Archbishop Hughes whom I had sent to Rome that he might urge the Pope to induce the Roman Catholics of the North, at least to be true to their oaths of allegiance, and whom I thanked publicly, when under the impression he had acted honestly according to the promise he had given me, is the very man who advised the Pope to recognize the legitimacy of the Southern Confederacy and put the weight of his tiara in the balance against us in favor of our enemies."

This carries its own refutation, but also accentuates the fact that the present generation knows very little of the details of the career of New York's first Archbishop. To the diplomatic mission to France, entrusted to him by President Lincoln and Secretary Seward, he added a visit to the Pope and afterwards to Ireland, also in the interest of the cause of the Union. In his reports to Secretary Seward Archbishop Hughes notes that Mr. Dayton, who was then our Minister to France, received him rather coldly. Not having been taken into the confidence of the Washington authorities as to the Archbishop's confidential mission, Dayton tried to hamper his efforts to obtain an interview with the Emperor Napoleon. This interview, however, the Archbishop brought about most satisfactorily on December 24, 1861. Three days later he wrote to Secretary Seward:

"I owe my introduction to the Emperor not to any kind encouragement or patronage of our people on this side but to determination that even the 'cold shoulder' should not prevent me from a purpose which I had entertained; so I wrote to him as one man would write to another, in a polite and brief note to the effect: 'Sir, I wish to have the honor of a conversation with you.'"

It was the very critical time of the "Trent affair," and the Archbishop in Paris and Thurlow Weed, his fellow-delegate abroad, in London, helped to avert an international crash. Then the Archbishop went to Rome, whence he reports to Secretary Seward, on February 21, 1862:

"I have had a most cordial and flattering reception in this capital among the civil and ecclesiastical magnates from the Pope

downward. The Holy Father has been particularly kind. He and Antonelli both speak of you with kind remembrance and with great respect. . . .

"The object which I hope to accomplish if I went to Spain can be as well accomplished here in Rome, and I shall see to it, with or without further instructions, for I consider Spain has the deepest interest in supporting the United States as they were, and as in a short time I hope to see them again."

In another letter to Mr. Seward written from Rome, on March 1, 1862, he says:

"You will hardly be surprised to learn that, on my arrival here I found communications from some of my Episcopal brethren not precisely censuring me, but yet complaining of my acceptance of any commission from the Government of our country, on the ground that it was, or might be, offensive or injurious to some of our Catholic brethren placed in circumstances of great embarrassment. I explained the whole matter to the Holy Father and to Cardinals Antonelli and Barnabo. I am happy to say that they all approved of my conduct, and instead of censuring me showed a disposition to confer additional honors."

Writing again to Mr. Seward, he informs him:

"A Roman gentleman told me a few days ago that the Southern Catholics who happened to be here hold me responsible for having prevented France and England from coming to the aid and support of their cause. My answer was, 'I hope the accusation is true.'"

Early in July, the Archbishop went from Rome to England and thence to Ireland, where he preached at the laying of the cornerstone of the new Catholic University, on July 20. A brief tour of the country was a triumphal success. He reached New York on August 12, his return being celebrated as a civic fete. A week later he went to Washington.

"I arrived on Thursday evening," he says, describing this official visit, "saw Mr. Seward and had a brief conversation with him. He invited me to dinner the next day. I reminded him that it was Friday, and not a good day for a banquet. He said: 'Never mind; I shall see that you will be provided for.' He invited his company to meet me, secretaries, generals and other distinguished gentlemen and to my astonishment, there was not a particle of meat on the table for any one. This was in compliment to myself, and in fact what I consider the most delicate compliment I have ever received."

In recognition of the Archbishop's services on this mission

abroad an official intimation was conveyed to the Holy See by the then United States Minister to Rome, Mr. Randall, that, unable to offer him a reward that he could accept, the President would feel particular gratification in any honors the Pope might have it in his power to confer upon him.

During the acute anti-slavery agitation before the war Cassius M. Clay wanted Archbishop Hughes to help the Republican party in politics. "I pray you," Clay wrote, "to change your alliances. Whilst we are not the advocates of 'Religion and State' we are the fast friends of religious freedom," and then he went on to express his "astonishment that our friendly and essentially unchanged feelings are not reciprocated by the Catholic Church."

In answer to this assumption that he had the management of the political consciences of his flock, Archbishop Hughes replied from New York, on February 6, 1858:

"My own principles are that the American people are able, in their own way, to manage their affairs of State without any guidance or instruction towards any class or religious denomination, by either priests or parsons. . . .

"As for myself, I never influenced a human being, Catholic or Protestant, as to the party to which he might think proper to attach himself in his capacity of a voting citizen. I never voted but once in my life, and that vote was cast nearly thirty years ago in favor of your illustrious namesake, and I believe relative, 'Harry of the West.' He was, in my estimation, a statesman as well as an orator, and I voted the more readily because my congregation were in the main opposed to him, and some of them had almost threatened me on account of my good opinion of him as a man much calumniated, but of whom as a statesman and orator, his country might well be proud.

"You can easily perceive by all this that the Catholics vote as individuals in the proper exercise of their franchise; but without any direction from their clergy, so far at least as has ever come under my knowledge, and certainly so far as the clergy under my own jurisdiction is concerned."

When the war broke out the Archbishop had his own ideas about chaplains and nurses. To the Archbishop of Baltimore he wrote, on May 9, 1861:

"The Superior of the Jesuits here called on me more than a week ago to state that their Society would be prepared to furnish for the spiritual necessities of the army, North and South, as many as ten chaplains, speaking all the civilized languages of

Europe or America. I heard him, but did not make any reply. For myself, I have sent but one chaplain with the Sixty-ninth regiment. . . .

"There is also another question growing up, and it is about nurses for the sick and wounded. Our Sisters of Mercy have volunteered after the example of their sisters toiling in the Crimean war. I have signified to them not harshly that they had better mind their own affairs until their services are needed. I am now informed, indirectly, that the Sisters of Charity in this diocese would be willing to volunteer a force of from fifty to one hundred nurses. To this proposition I have strong objections. They have as much on hand as they can accomplish. Besides it would seem to me natural and proper that the Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg should occupy the very honorable post of nursing the sick and wounded."

In time, of course, the evolution of the war forced a change in these opinions, and on October 21, 1861, President Lincoln wrote to Archbishop Hughes from Washington:

"I find no law authorizing the appointment of chaplains for our *hospitals*; and yet the services of chaplains are more needed, perhaps, in the hospitals than with the healthy soldiers in the field. With this view, I have given a sort of *quasi* appointment (a copy of which I enclose) to each of three Protestant ministers who have accepted and entered upon the duties.

"If you perceive no objection, I will thank you to give me the name or names, of one or more suitable persons of the Catholic Church to whom I may with propriety tender the same service.

"Many thanks for your kind and judicious letters to Gov. Seward, and which he regularly allows me the pleasure and profit of perusing."

The two histories, by John R. Hassard, "Life of Most Rev. John Hughes," and Lawrence Kehoe, "Works of Most Rev. John Hughes," that record these and the many other interesting incidents of the career of this great prelate, unfortunately have long been out of print. The copies still available in libraries would provide most instructive lessons of conduct just at present for all classes of patriotic citizens.

Hassard had the advantage of getting his material as to the personal traits, private habits and peculiarities of the prelate from his surviving relatives and most closely intimate friends, and from his correspondence, so from this source we can now draw these details of what he set down as an unimpeachable accurate portrait.

He stood, he tells us, about five feet nine inches in height, well formed with a powerful frame, and in early and middle life an erect carriage. He had a remarkable large head, prominent features, a large but well-shaped Roman nose, keen gray eyes, a sharp resolute mouth and brown hair. As he became bald early he wore a wig from the time of his consecration as a Bishop. He was very jealous of his dignity as a prelate, and would suffer no one to forget its requirements, though he would unbend himself at times. To strangers he was generally kind and assuring. His voice was clear and musical, his movements unconstrained without pompousness or affectation and his dress neat but not finical.

The poverty of his forebears and his humble origin were a source of pride to him. It was a proof, he said, that his ancestors "had always been faithful to their religion." He had very few intimate friends and mingled very little with the world. At one time his secretary, Rev. Dr. James R. Bayley (afterwards Archbishop of Baltimore) arranged to have several Catholic gentlemen give dinner parties to which a number of notable citizens were invited to meet the Archbishop, believing that this would bring a stimulant of helpful variety into the routine of his Grace's daily life. He always appeared to great advantage at them, but could never be induced to follow up the acquaintances he made on these occasions. Except on St. Patrick's Day, when he invited the city priests to dine with him, he very seldom entertained company himself and rarely made visits of friendship or ceremony.

Unless business obliged him to do so he took no exercise. He sat up late at night writing or preparing his papers or controversies. Composition was easy for him, and he seldom revised what he wrote, but would often ask his friend Peter Hargous, or some other man he trusted, to go over what he had written. His rising hour in the morning was late, and he took no breakfast except a cup of coffee, and ate his other meals irregularly. When not otherwise occupied after he had read his Office and attended to official business, he spent much time reading newspapers, rarely taking up a book. This habit stimulated his zeal for controversy. From 1843 he began to dictate to an amanuensis, at first occasionally, and in later years altogether, as his fingers were so crippled by rheumatism that he could not write without pain. His polemical

discussions for long periods, almost took up the whole time of his daily occupations.

As a consequence of his irregular education he lacked all idea of order or system, never followed a regular plan of action; never laid out his work in advance. He was not persevering, and when a success was achieved he often neglected to pursue it to its legitimate consequences. Great results such as the overthrow of the trustee system and the Public School Society, Mr. Hassard declares, originated by accident. His books and papers were usually in disorder, and, although he had a logical mind, a wonderful memory, and great natural aptitude for learning, the habit he contracted of trusting to superficial scholarship and hastily assimilated knowledge injured his style of reasoning, and manifested the discursiveness and want of system that were his chief mental defects.

There was constant worry over his bank account with his secretary. He never learned how to manage its details. No memoranda of deposits were made; sometimes only the amount of the checks he had drawn was noted; sometimes only the name of the payee; sometimes only a date or the number. His secretary would make two packages of gold and silver for the supposed amount the Archbishop might need for expenses when he started out on a journey, but no matter what the amount he never brought any money back home with him. A tale of distress always moved him to a lavish gift.

Although from the general repute of his imperious disposition, and the sharp tone of his writings, he was supposed to be a severe man, he really had a very kind heart. He was very fond of children and had the keenest solicitude for the welfare and comfort of the orphans. Hence, when the action of the Superiors of the Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg in withdrawing the Sisters from New York threatened to frustrate his plans for the care of the diocesan dependents he did not hesitate to write (August 24, 1846) to Sister Rosalia who had been sent to New York as a Visitatrix to further negotiate the controversy:

"This kind of business has gone far enough . . . I mean no personal disrespect when I communicate to you a message which must seem rude addressed to a Christian and religious lady, viz.: that I wish and request and require that you shall leave the diocese of New York with as little delay as possible. I shall toler-

ate no officer of a religious community, male or female, exercising without my advisement and consent, powers of disturbance and embarrassment, such as have been exercised, conscientiously no doubt, in my diocese of late."

The consternation of the good Sister on the reception of this mandate can be imagined. The correspondence with Father Deluol, the Superior at Emmitsburg, also had been acrimonious. At midnight, at the close of 1846, the Archbishop wrote Father Deluol:

"The most painful controversy of my life has just been that closed. . . . On reviewing my share of it, I regret that I have used expression, and a certain pungency of style toward you, which at the time seemed not only justifiable but almost expedient. I regret them. They must have given you pain. They gave no comfort to me. At all events they were unnecessary, and I regret. I retract them. . . . One other wish of which the sounding midnight reminds me, as it does of the *nugae fugaces* that fly with time, is to you that of a Happy New Year, which I trust you will not reject *quand même* from your sincere servant in Christ."

When Archbishop Hughes first came to New York he joined with zest in the semi-community routine in which Bishop Dubois had been accustomed to regulate the episcopal residence in Mulberry Street. When he became the ordinary himself he continued to occupy this plain and sparsely furnished house until 1855. He had then returned from Rome with the pallium of the archbishopric, and the impaired state of his health prompted the trustees of the Cathedral to purchase a country house for him at Manhattanville, but, as has been stated, he made little use of it. He was irregular and notional about eating, and restless and changeable in his associations when age and the ever-increasing debility of his insidious malady prevented his wonted activity in affairs. For nine months before he died he was unable to say Mass, and his last sermon was delivered on June 23, 1863, at the dedication of St. Teresa's Church. He was too weak to stand and spoke sitting down.

When Mgr. Bedini, the pro-Nuncio to Brazil, who had such an unpleasant experience with the K. K. K. of 1853, during his visit to the United States, asked a priest why it was that Archbishop Hughes enjoyed so much higher popular estimation than any of his brother prelates the answer was: "I think it is because he is always game."

V

A DAY IN GREENWICH VILLAGE

Among the first things many visitors to New York set out to do is to explore that wonderland of the Sunday supplement, Greenwich Village. The Catholic contingent among the visitors is no mean proportion of the whole, but it is a safe assertion to make that few of them know that they could wander about and find many interesting Catholic attractions and historic spots entirely outside and apart from the "artistic" and fake Bohemian characteristics that sensational Sunday stories and magazine fiction have attributed to this part of New York.

The first mention in Catholic records of the geographical section that includes Greenwich Village is the letter written by Bishop John Carroll on August 25, 1803, to his friend James Barry giving details of his proposed trip to dedicate the old Franklin Street Church of the Holy Cross in Boston and which is quoted on another page of this volume in the biographical notes about Andrew Morris. James Barry was then a wealthy merchant of New York and Washington and one of Bishop Carroll's most intimate friends. He and his wife were also the special patrons of Mother Seton after her conversion. Her letters which her grandson Archbishop Robert Seton published in two volumes ("Memoirs, Letters and Diary of Elizabeth Seton," 1869) have frequent references to the help and benefactions of the Barrys. Barry lost most of his fortune in the futile land schemes that in pioneer days were expected to develop Washington as the capital city.

In the first quarter of the last century Greenwich Village developed into what would now be called the "100 per cent American" section of the city. The Grand Kleagle of the day found it a prolific spot for the cultivation of intolerance and under such inspiration a disgraceful anti-Catholic riot wrecked the homes of a settlement of Irish Catholic artisans on July 12, 1824.

In spite of the hostile atmosphere the Catholic element in the Village grew. George Pardow, who was the publisher of the

Truth Teller, the first New York Catholic weekly, lived in Greene Street on its eastern fringe. His daughters Julia and Helen were for many years superiors respectively of the New York Convent of the Sacred Heart and the Convent of Mercy; his granddaughters were Mother Augusta and Mother Pauline Pardow of the Sacred Heart Congregation, and his grandsons the late Rev. William O'Brien Pardow and the Rev. Robert Pardow, the Jesuits of recent years.

In 1829 as there were enough Catholics in the Village to warrant the starting of a church, St. Joseph's parish was organized. When the church, which still stands at Sixth Avenue and Washington Place, opened three years later, it was next to St. Patrick's, the largest in the city, and a marvel of "artistic Italian architecture." It is intimately related to the vigorous inception of Catholic literary New York, for shortly after it was finished the learned Dr. Charles Constantine Pise was made its pastor in which office he served until 1838, the period of much of his literary activity. His successor as pastor was the first American Cardinal, John McCloskey. As Dr. Pise was a popular preacher as well as writer, the coming of the gentle, and then unknown, Father McCloskey was resented by a strong element in the congregation in which the evil spirit of "trusteeism" was still rife. The rebels, who wanted Dr. Pise retained, were largely influenced by another literary light, Patrick Sarsfield Casserly, an old-fashioned school master who came to New York in 1824 and opened a once famous classical school at No. 36 Cherry Street (see RECORDS AND STUDIES, Vol. II). He was a frequent contributor to Dr. Pise's *Weekly Expositor* and edited a "Jacob's Greek Reader," of which sixteen editions were published, and a book on Latin prosody (1845) used in classical schools for two generations. A pamphlet, widely circulated, "New England Critics and New York Editors," was his reply to an article on six Greek lexicons in the *North American Review* of March, 1845.

The opposition to Father McCloskey, which was met with a calm and dignified suffrance, died down after a time and his former critics became his ardent admirers. Dr. Pise went to found St. Charles' parish in Brooklyn where he died after a long and happy administration. A later pastor at St. Joseph's (1867), the Rev. Thomas Farrell, when Brownson's *Review* failed, joined

with the Rev. Jeremiah Cummings of St. Stephen's and raised the fund that purchased the annuity to enable Orestes A. Brownson peacefully to live out his later years. Father Farrell in his will left a sum of money with which the Church of St. Benedict the Moor, the first New York church for colored Catholics, was started in 1883. This church was located first in Bleeker Street, which is the heart of Greenwich Village, but later was moved up to West Fifty-third Street. The Bleeker Street church was then used for the very large congregation of Our Lady of Pompeii, ministered to by the spiritual sons of that illustrious prelate Bishop Scalabrini. Not far from it is the Franciscan Friary of St. Anthony of Padua in Sullivan Street with its imposing church which enjoys the distinction of being the first church built in the United States (1859) for an Italian congregation.

Nearby in Bleeker Street, where the Mills Hotel stands, was Depau Row, once the most fashionable residence block in the city. It was built by a wealthy French shipping merchant, Francis Depau, whose wife was Sylvie de Grasse, daughter of the admiral famous in our Revolution annals. The neighborhood was regarded as the "French section" almost up to the beginning of the present generation. The French Catholic nursery, school and its pretty chapel on southeast Washington Square are the only relics now of this by-gone day. The Square also was the location of the first house of the Sisters of Mercy; the first Foundling Asylum of the Sisters of Charity at the corner of University Place and the first office and residence whence the first four volumes of *America*, the national Catholic review conducted by the Jesuit Fathers, were published at No. 32 Washington Square West.

In the "very center of Village things," Eleventh Street and Seventh Avenue, is St. Vincent's, New York's first Catholic hospital, in the founding of which for the Sisters of Charity another literary celebrity, Rev. Dr. Felix Varela, had much to do, and Mulry Square, in the immediate vicinity, honors the splendid career of Thomas M. Mulry, the American Ozanam. So, as has been said, the wanderers among the tangled streets and nooks of Greenwich Village can find many very interesting spots of Catholic historical and literary renown if they only take the trouble to look them up.

VI

THE NEW YORK EMMETS

During the visit to New York of William T. Cosgrave, President of the Irish Free State, he made a trip to St. Paul's Church yard, Broadway, on February 2, 1928, and there laid wreaths on the memorials to his illustrious fellow countrymen General Richard Montgomery, Thomas Addis Emmet and Dr. William James Macneven. In the press reports of this event it was stated that he thus decorated "the graves" of these celebrities, and, at the municipal banquet that followed, one of the speakers referred to them as "three Protestants." Both statements presented historical errors. There is only one grave, though there are three memorials, at St. Paul's. Neither Emmet nor Macneven is buried there, and Macneven was a Catholic, a member of an old Galway Catholic family.

Dr. William James Macneven landed in New York on July 4, 1805, and joined his old friends, the Emmets, who were spending the summer at New Brunswick, N. J. He immediately entered on the practice of his profession and in 1808 became a member of the faculty of the College of Physicians and Surgeons. He was educated in Austria where his uncle, Baron Macneven, was court physician to the Empress Maria Theresa. In 1812 Governor Clinton appointed him resident physician, equivalent to the present Health Commissioner, and in 1826 he left the College of Physicians and joined the Doctors Hosack, Francis, Mott and others in starting the rival Duane street school. He published several medical works, one on the atomic theory attracting much notice at home and abroad.

He spoke several continental languages fluently and was a forceful writer and public speaker. As he was the only Catholic among the '98 leaders who came to New York, he at once took rank here as a leader among his Catholic brethren and his home in Park Place became the center of a brilliant circle made up of those prominent in art, science and literature. The politics of his adopted country also claimed his active participation, and special importance was always attached to his opinions.

A curious instance of this, indicating also the fickleness of popular favor, was shown in 1834, when in the contest between Jackson and the United States Bank he took the side of the bank. Immediately he was made the target of a storm of abuse from his enraged fellow-countrymen for having deserted "Old Hickory." His house was mobbed and he was even threatened with personal violence. He bore all with dignity and equanimity and in time saw the unjust accusations of partisan rancor forgotten long before his death, which took place on July 12, 1841, at the country residence of his son-in-law, M. T. Emmet in Harlem. Bishop Hughes administered the last rites of the Church to him.

"The burial ground of the Riker family is on the shore of Bowery Bay, Long Island," says his daughter, Margaret, in a memoir she prepared for the "Lives of the United Irishmen," "within a short distance of the old family mansion, and there the mortal remains of my dear father rest beside his children and near to it a plain monument of white marble marks the grave of his friend, Mr. Sampson."

On June 15, 1810, Dr. Macneven was married in New York to Jane Margaret Tom, widow of John Tom, a New York merchant and daughter of Samuel Riker of Newtown, L. I. Her brother, Richard Riker, eminent lawyer, District Attorney and Recorder of New York, had long been an intimate friend of Macneven and Sampson. In the memoir above cited Miss Macneven says:

"My grandfather Riker, a descendant of the early Dutch settlers, resided on his farm on the shore of the beautiful bay about eight miles from the city. He served his country during her revolutionary struggles, and afterwards as a representative in Congress, and had a mind and a heart to appreciate and understand men like my father and Mr. Sampson, whose society he greatly enjoyed. Mr. Sampson * * * had always great delight in boating, and during his years of health and vigor was never without a boat large enough to hold himself, his friends and their families, and it was one of his greatest pleasure to collect them together and make excursions up the river to visit the Rikers, his friends at Bowery Bay. The sail from New York up the East River is one of much variety and beauty with just sufficient peril in passing through the narrow passage called Hell-gate, to

give it a romantic interest. But Mr. Sampson was a master of boat-craft and used safely to conduct his little vessel through all dangers until it entered the smooth waters of the bay, when he would give notice of his approach by playing the flute, always his companion, and he was greeted by a hearty welcome before his boat could reach the shore."

The contrast between the Bowery Bay of the present with this picture need not be dwelt on here.

Since 1803 the Emmet family have been socially, politically and professionally prominent in New York. But few are familiar with that interesting chapter of their history. For three generations the Emmets have been distinguished as doctors and lawyers. The great-grandfather of the present generation, Dr. Robert Emmet, practiced the medical profession first in Cork and then in Dublin, where, in 1771, he received the appointment of State Physician, an office he held until his death in 1802.

He had seventeen children, but only four lived beyond childhood, a daughter and three sons, Temple, Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet. The first was called to the bar, but died in 1788 after a brilliant career of seven years. His brother, Thomas Addis, was designed for the profession of their father, and had completed a very promising medical course in Edinburgh and on the continent when the death of his brother Temple changed his destiny. He went to London, took up the study of law and was admitted to the bar in 1790. In an effort to perpetuate a family name five of Dr. Emmet's seventeen children were successively christened Robert. Four of them died in infancy. The survivor, who was the famous patriot martyr, was born March 4, 1778, and was the youngest of the family. In his fifteenth year he entered Trinity College, Dublin, where the great proficiency he displayed gave promise of as brilliant a record as that attained by his brothers.

In the spring of 1798 Thomas Addis Emmet was arrested for his connection with the Society of United Irishmen, and Robert, shortly after, was expelled from Trinity with eighteen other students for sympathy with the patriotic cause. Robert Emmet is not known to have participated in the rising of 1798 and did not take the oath of the United Irishmen. He went to the continent in 1801 and was in Paris later, intending to accompany his

brother Thomas Addis to America. There he had interviews with Talleyrand and Napoleon and tried to interest them to help out an Irish rebellion. In 1803 he returned to Ireland to take part in a rising, in the preparations for which he was active until its disastrous ending in July of that year. He might have escaped to France, but, delaying to visit his fiancée, Sarah Curran, he was betrayed to the government and arrested on August 25. His famous trial, followed by his execution on September 20, ended his career.

Obscurity must always cloud the last hours and acts of Robert Emmet. The government was anxious to get him out of the way, fearing rescue or escape. So popular was he that no one would consent to act as his hangman until a deserter from the army condemned to death was persuaded, in return for a pardon, to do the work. This was one Barney Moran. He lived until August, 1878, when he died in his ninety-ninth year in the poorhouse at Ballina, County Mayo. His secret was revealed after his death.

Thomas Addis Emmet and a number of his fellow United Irishmen were confined for several years after their arrest in Fort George, Scotland. The government not being able to convict them of treason offered to let them out provided they would emigrate to the United States. Rufus King was then our Minister to England and his associates in the Federalist Party had passed the alien and sedition laws. He and they did not like the Irish, especially the patriotic kind, and he put obstacles in the way of the Fort George prisoners coming here. Writing to one of them from Brighton on August 23, 1799, King said:

"I ought to inform you that I really have no authority to give or refuse permission to you or any other foreigner to go to the United States, the admission and residence of strangers in that country being a matter that, by a late law, exclusively belongs to the President. It is time that the government of this country, in the course of the last year, in consequence of my interference, gave me assurance that a particular description of persons in Ireland who it was understood were going to the United States should not be allowed to proceed without our consent; this restraint would doubtless be withdrawn in favor of individuals against whose emigration I should not object."

He then goes on to state that instigated by French agents "un-

fortunately a portion of our inhabitants has erroneously supposed that our civil and political institutions as well as our national policy, might be improved by a close imitation of France. . . . I am sorry to make the remark that a large proportion of the emigrants from Ireland, and especially in the Middle States, has upon this occasion arraigned themselves to the side of the malcontents. I ought to except from this remark most of the enlightened and well-educated Irishmen who reside among us, and with few exceptions I might confine it to the indigent and illiterate, who entertaining an attachment to freedom, are unable to appreciate those salutary restraints without which it degenerates into anarchy. It would be injustice to say that the Irish emigrants are more national than those of other countries, yet being a numerous though very minor portion of our population, they are capable from causes it is needless now to explain, of being generally brought to act in concert, and, under artful leaders, may be, as they have been, enlisted in mischievous combinations against our government!"

As a result of Rufus King's interference the Irish State prisoners spent nearly three years longer in their Fort George confinement. But they got even with him later in New York.

After his release from Fort George, where he had been held a prisoner for four years, Thomas Addis Emmet went to Paris and thence came to New York with his wife, his eldest son, Robert, and three daughters landing here to begin life anew on November 11, 1804. Three other sons, John, Temple and Thomas, who were left in Ireland, followed a year later. Emmet, by marriage was related to the Harman Blennerhassett, who was the unfortunate victim of Aaron Burr's Southwest Empire scheme. When Blennerhassett knew Emmet had reached New York he hastened here from the beautiful home he had created on the island in the Ohio river near Marietta to try and get him to go out and settle there. New York politics were then in a turbulent state. Burr had recently killed Alexander Hamilton in the historic duel and was discredited locally. George Clinton, Daniel D. Tompkins and other anti-Federalist leaders needed an orator and a man of special legal attainments to champion their policies so they persuaded Emmet to remain in New York. He was admitted to practice in the Supreme Court of the United States during a visit to Wash-

ington and the New York legislature passed a special act entitling him to practice in all the courts of the State before he was naturalized. He filed his formal application for citizenship three days after landing.

At the bar his success was immediate and so marked that the Federalists formed a cabal against him. His ability and exalted character, however, overcame all opposition. The chance against Rufus King came in 1807 when King was the Federalist candidate for governor. Emmet and his fellow exiles helped the Clintons to beat him soundly in a campaign in which King's effort to keep the Irish State prisoners out of the United States was made a leading issue and a factor in retiring King to private life in the old mansion still standing at Jamaica.

A letter written by Emmet to Blennerhasset on September 15, 1809, tells him "I have three sons at school at Flatbush, Long Island, five miles from this city, under the care of a Mr. Thompson, who is very competent, a graduate of Trinity College, Dublin, and of very unexceptionable character." He urges Blennerhasset also to send his son Dominick there, which he probably did. When Blennerhasset, ruined by his connection with Aaron Burr's escapade, went back to Ireland in 1822, he left his wife in destitution living in Flatbush. Their son, Harman, lost his mind and became a wanderer about New York, where he lived cared for by the Emmets until they buried him in 1854. They did the same charitable act for the mother in 1842.

Thomas Addis Emmet was made colonel of an Irish regiment raised for the defense of New York in 1812 and in August of the same year was appointed Attorney General of the State, an office he held for two years and then resigned to return to his private practice, which was lucrative. The family lived at the southwest corner of Pine and Nassau Streets for many years and finally at No. 20 Beach Street, where he died November 14, 1827. He had been stricken with apoplexy in court on the previous day while defending the Sailors Snug Harbor institutions against a raid by alleged heirs of its founder.

The summer residence of the Emmet family was on the old Middle Road, at about what is now Fifty-fourth Street and Fifth Avenue, Manhattan. At Pine Street they occupied two houses, the lower part of one being used by Mr. Emmet and his sons as

law offices. These two houses and the Presbyterian Church on the corner of Wall Street, with its graveyard, took up the entire block from Wall to Pine Street. Mr. Emmet was buried in the vault of his old friend Chancellor Jones in St. Mark's Church in the Bowerie. The monument to his memory at the Fulton Street corner of St. Paul's Churchyard, Broadway, was erected by a public subscription in 1832 and cost \$3,535. The largest amount of this sum, about \$1,600, was given by his Catholic admirers—none of the Emmets was a Catholic—in recognition for his early efforts for Catholic emancipation in Ireland. The Gaelic inscription on this memorial was composed by Bishop England of Charleston. Its translation reads: "He contemplated invaluable benefits for the land of his birth; he gave eclat to the land of his death and received in return her love and admiration." There are two other inscriptions on it; the English composed by Julian C. Verplanck; the Latin by Professor John Duer.

The Thomas Addis Emmet of our day, grandson of the first of the name and during most of his long life one of the most eminent physicians of New York, in the life he compiled of his grandfather and granduncle, Robert, relates how a few years ago he hunted up the old Jones vault at St. Mark's and went into it to locate his grandfather's remains. "Everything but the bones and a few screws had disappeared," he says. "The condition of the teeth sockets showed that he must have lost all his teeth some years before his death. * * * The only bodily defect from which Mr. Emmet suffered was apparently due to the condition of his teeth, and this was doubtless owing to some remediable cause. The luxury or necessity of a toothbrush was unknown or not fully appreciated during the greater portion of Mr. Emmet's life. * * * With Mr. Emmet's otherwise perfect bodily condition the knowledge of dental surgery of the present day could have prolonged his life beyond the span of one hundred years."

The Emmet residences were the centers of all that was best in local art, literature, music and the other incidents of the highest culture. The younger members of the family intermarried with the Le Roys, the McEvers, Graves and others of social prominence and their descendants after more than a century are still high up on the register.

It is a curious fact that with the exception of the venerable

Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet, who died March 1, 1919, in Manhattan, notwithstanding the intense patriotism of the two brothers during the United Irishmen rebellion of 1798, the New York Emmets kept aloof from the nationalist efforts of their fellow countrymen. Dr. Emmet explains this in his life of his grandfather, who had, he says, "so little pleasure associated with the past in Ireland that after his arrival in this country neither he nor his wife ever referred to Irish affairs or to the family history if it were possible to avoid doing so. He felt bitterly about the tragedies of this portion of his life, so much so that in a large number of letters * * * in but three instances did Mr. Emmet make any allusion to his family or past history. * * * In another letter he expressed the hope that 'no one of the name would ever put foot on the soil of Ireland while she remained under British rule.' And the other instance was to the effect that he wished the past forgotten and the history of the family to begin with its settlement in this country."

Of his sons the most distinguished were Robert, who became a Judge of one of the New York courts and had a long and honorable career on the Bench, and John Patton, who followed the family tradition and studied medicine. He went South to practice, first to Charleston, S. C., and finally located as professor of chemistry at the University of Virginia. His son, Thomas Addis, also became a physician and attained special professional eminence in that calling in New York. In addition to his distinction in medicine he was one of the most famous collectors of American historical data. Most of the books and autographs of his collection, on which he spent a fortune, are now in the American section of the New York Public Library.

He also was the author of an exhaustive history of the Emmet family and of his grandfather and uncle, "Memoirs of Thomas Addis and Robert Emmet" (2 vols., New York, 1915); and "Memoirs of My Life" (New York, 1911), which contain a mass of Irish and local New York records. It is notable that he was the only member of the family that took part in the agitations here against the English rule in Ireland. During the Land League Movement he was president for several years of the Irish National League of America and contributed generously of his money, his time and his pen ("Ireland Under English Rule,"

New York, 1903) to further the cause. It seems one of the ironies of fate that his grandson, a young man of brilliant promise, was killed during the World War while wearing the uniform of a British officer and serving under the flag his grandfather and his ancestors regarded as the symbol of everything tyrannical and detestable. Two sons of Judge Robert Emmet, Temple and Richard Riker Emmet, served as lieutenants in the 88th New York Volunteers of Meagher's Irish Brigade during the Civil War. Both died in 1862 of fever contracted in the Peninsula campaign of McClellan's army.

Dr. Thomas Addis Emmet married a Catholic, Miss Catherine R. Duncan, February 14, 1854, and became a convert to the Faith ten years later. The immediate occasion of his decision, he related in his "Memoirs," was a sermon by the Redemptorist Father Gross he heard during a Mission at St. Stephen's Church, New York, into which he happened to stray on his way to the hospital where he attended. Dr. Emmet received the Laetare Medal for 1899, and at the instance of Archbishop Farley, Pius X made him a Knight of St. Gregory December 19, 1906. In accordance with his expressed wish his remains were taken to Ireland, in September, 1922, and buried in Glasnevin Cemetery, Dublin.

In the old burial plot of the Riker family, where the once placid and pleasant waters of Bowery Bay lap the shore of the northeast corner of the former Long Island City besides Dr. Macneven there were also buried another United Irishman of the rebellion of 1798—William Sampson, and Catherine, the widow of Captain Tone, son of Theobald Wolf Tone, the founder and organizer of the United Irishmen. Sampson, although not a Catholic, has a most honorable place in New York's Catholic history, and several of the Tones, notable Mother Tone, a Religious of the Sacred Heart, were within the Fold in the succeeding generation. William Sampson was a very great friend of the Rikers and wished to be buried among them. His daughter, Catherine, who became Captain Tone's wife, also found a resting place beside her father and his old friends.

The headstones show that the interments began in the Riker plot in 1721. When the family sold the old farm to Jacob P. Rapelye this section was reserved and the Rikers retain the right

of sepulture there. It is located about twenty-five yards inside the old city line. These are the graves that have a special interest:

Doctor William James Macneven, United Irishman, born in Galway, 1793; died in New York, 1841.

Jane Macneven, widow of Doctor Macneven, and daughter of Samuel Riker, died 1868, aged 85 years.

William Sampson, United Irishman, born 1764; died 1836.

Grace Sampson, wife of William Sampson, died 1853.

Catherine Anne Tone, wife of the son of Theobald Wolf Tone, and the daughter of William Sampson, died 1864, aged 66 years.

Jane Purdy, daughter of William J. Macneven, died 1856; Samuel Riker Macneven, died 1851; William Macneven, M.D., died 1854, aged 56 years; Rose Patience Macneven, died 1839; James Joseph Macneven, died 1822.

The third of these Irish exiles of '98, William Sampson, was born in Londonderry in 1764. His father was a Protestant minister. He was a lawyer of repute in Belfast when he was engaged professionally to defend the unfortunate victims charged by the Government with treason.

In New York Mr. Sampson's legal ability soon placed him among the prominent lawyers of the day. He was one of the few men who knew how to use shorthand, and his facility in this accomplishment won him a unique place among the pleaders at the bar. A famous case which brings him into our Catholic records, and in which he was engaged and of which he made the record afterwards in a published volume, established the inviolability of the Confessional and was the means of placing among the laws of New York State, and its subsequent adoption by other States, of the statute of December 10, 1828, which enacts: "No minister of the Gospel or priest of any denomination whatsoever, shall be allowed to disclose any confession made to him in his professional character in the course of discipline enjoined by the rules or practices of such denomination."

The occasion of this was a suit brought against the Jesuit Father Anthony Kohlmann, by a man named James Keating, who demanded that the priest should reveal whence he had received some stolen goods he had returned to Keating.

Father Kohlmann refused, on the ground that no court could require a priest to give evidence in regard to matters known to

him only under the seal of Confession. For this Father Kohlmann, on June 8, 1813, was summoned before the Court of General Sessions, composed of De Witt Clinton, then Mayor of the city; Josiah Ogden Hoffman, the Recorder; and Aldermen Isaac S. Douglas and Richard Cunningham. His right to refuse was defended by Sampson and Richard Riker, and a decision in favor of the priest, delivered by Clinton, was unanimously approved by the rest of the court. Its principle was later embodied in the State law.

Sampson later published the full record of the trial "The Catholic Question in the United States" (New York, 1813) and as an appendix to it Father Kohlmann added an exhaustive treatise "A True Exposition of the Doctrine of the Catholic Church Touching the Sacrament of Penance with the Ground on which this Sacrament is Founded."

Mr. Sampson died in New York December 28, 1836, and was buried from St. John's Church, the Rev. Dr. Henry Anthon reading the funeral service, after which, as with Dr. Macneven's, the remains were caried across the East River to the Riker plot.

Few among the present generation know the association of these eminent men with the New York of a century ago, and fewer still are actuated by the patriotic sentiments that might lead them to desire to hallow the spot where their bones were placed to rest after their long and honored careers in their native land and in the country of their adoption.

VII

NUMBER TWENTY-FOUR VESEY STREET

In 1816, the Jesuit Father, Benedict J. Fenwick, was pastor of St. Peter's, Barclay Street, New York, and acting Vicar General and Administrator of the diocese pending the arrival from Rome of Bishop Connolly. He lived at No. 15 Jay Street, where early in that year an Episcopalian minister came and introduced himself as the Rev. Virgil Horace Barber, President of an academy at Fairfield, near Utica, New York. He was in search of information concerning the doctrines of the Catholic Church, and the solution of religious problems and doubts that for some time had troubled his mind.

Virgil Barber was the son of Daniel Barber, who was born at Simsbury, Connecticut, October 2, 1756, and was one of the volunteers who joined the Continental army from Connecticut after the battle of Bunker Hill and participated in the siege of Boston. He was with his regiment during the engagements about New York and was mustered out because of ill health after the battle of Long Island. In early life he belonged to the Congregational Church but later became an Episcopalian, and was ordained a minister of that denomination, in 1787, at Schenectady, New York, by Bishop Provost, after which he was given charge of the church at Claremont, New Hampshire, and ministered there for the following twenty-four years. At Claremont, in 1807, he baptized Fanny Allen, daughter of General Ethan Allen of Revolutionary fame. She became a Catholic and on September 29, 1808, joined the community of the convent at the Hotel Dieu, Montreal.

Daniel Barber visited Fanny Allen during her stay at the Montreal convent and was present at her profession there in 1810. He was much impressed by all he saw and began to read controversial works. Wishing for further information he went to Boston and called on Father Cheverus (the subsequent Cardinal) then attached to the Franklin Street church. Father Cheverus answered

all his questions, and gave him several more books of instruction to carry back home with him.

At this time his son Virgil, who had followed him into the ministry, was living with his wife and children as head of the Episcopal Academy at Fairfield, New York. They had an Irish servant maid. One day Mr. Barber found her reading a little book "A Novena to St. Francis Xavier" in which also was a brief life of the Saint. He borrowed it and became filled with zeal over the account it gave of the great missionary. He went to visit his father in New Hampshire and there found the controversial literature Father Cheverus had supplied. These books he took home with him and he and his wife read them attentively. They soon were much upset by the spiritual problems that presented themselves and the young minister determined to go to New York and seek for more information in the libraries of Trinity and St. Paul's Churches and from the Episcopal Bishop Hobart. As the responses from these sources during the week he remained in the city did not satisfy him, he called on Father Fenwick at 15 Jay Street.

The Jesuit received him very cordially, patiently solving all his difficulties and gave him several new books to study, with permission to come again if his investigations so inclined him. Mr. Barber went back to his church and school at Fairfield, where he and his wife continued reading the controversial volumes given him and discussing points of doctrine, the debating circle gradually including neighboring ministers as well as his associate teachers in the academy. Several months later he paid another visit to New York where, after a long consultation and exposition of his mental struggles, Father Fenwick advised him to return to Fairfield, resign his ministry, settle his affairs at the school and move to New York where another school would be secured for him. He agreed to this and was formally received into the Catholic Church, after which he informed his Fairfield congregation of his change of faith, bade them a final adieu and left for New York with his wife and children.

When the Barbers reached New York, Father Fenwick hospitably received them and secured a new home for them at No. 24 Vesey Street. Bishop Hobart, the Episcopalian rector of Trinity Church, lived in the next house. There a school was

opened. It was a success from the start. Mrs. Barber and the children were baptized Catholics soon after their arrival in New York and she and her husband received their First Communion in St. Peter's, Barclay Street, on February 9, 1817. The Barber school at No. 24 Vesey Street lasted less than a year, its ending being the result of one of the most extraordinary incidents in the whole religious life of the country. Barber was then 34 years old; his wife 28; and the five children, 8, 7, 5 and 3 years, and the youngest, 8 months, old respectively.

During this year in New York, Mr. and Mrs. Barber began to aspire to a higher degree of spiritual perfection, to reach which they resolved to consecrate themselves entirely to the service of God by separating and joining a Religious Community. They consulted their friend Father Fenwick as to the possibility of accomplishing this desire with justice to the children. Astonished at the proposal, he told them he saw no immediate way of meeting it and advised them to give it up. Bishop Connolly had then arrived in New York from Rome and assumed charge. Father Fenwick left for the Georgetown, D. C., College, and the Jesuit foundation in New York was abandoned until 1846, when another community of the Society came back to begin St. John's College, Fordham. Before leaving, Father Fenwick commended the Barber family to the new Bishop, who also became interested in them and they soon communicated with their former director recalling to his attention their desire to enter the religious life and asking if something could not be done at Georgetown to further it.

The rector at Georgetown then was Father John Grassi, one of the notable men of the lately restored Society. Archbishop Neale of Baltimore was residing at the Visitation Convent at Georgetown, near which also Father Fenwick's mother was living so as to be close to her three sons, who were Jesuits. All three entered with keen interest into the idea of helping the Barbers to do as they wished. Father Grassi agreed to receive Virgil Barber as a Jesuit novice, and his six year old son Samuel as a pupil at Georgetown College. Archbishop Neale consented to allow Mrs. Barber to enter the Visitation Convent as a nun, and the three elder daughters, Mary, Abigail and Susan, as pupils in the convent school. Mrs. Fenwick agreed to take the youngest child, the ten months old Josephine, and to care for her until she also was

old enough to go to the convent school. Early in June, 1817, the school at No. 24 Vesey Street was closed and the seven Barbers set out for Georgetown where the formal separation took place on June 21.

Father Grassi invited Mrs. Barber to dine in the community refectory, a privilege never granted before to any woman. After this they all repaired to the college chapel where Archbishop Neale, in presence of a number of the clergy and laity, received the individual assents of Mr. and Mrs. Barber to the decree of separation and they thus formally renounced each other. Mr. Barber and the little Samuel then went into the college; Mrs. Barber and three of her daughters were conducted to the Visitation Convent, and the baby Josephine was given into the motherly care of Mrs. Fenwick. The subsequent careers of this remarkable family were as extraordinary as this event that began their lives as Religious.

Soon after this separation of the Barber family, Father Grassi went to Rome and took Virgil with him. Mr. Barber remained there for a year and then returned to Georgetown. In 1818 he paid a visit to his old home at Claremont, New Hampshire, taking the Rev. Charles Ffrench, O. P., then rector of St. Peter's, Barclay Street, with him. They spent a week at Daniel Barber's home, Father Ffrench celebrating Mass several times—the first ever said in that section—and preaching a sort of mission. The result was the conversion of Daniel Barber's wife; Mrs. Tyler, his sister; her husband and their four sons and four daughters. One of these sons, William, then sixteen years old, became the first Catholic Bishop of Hartford, Connecticut, and the four daughters all joined the Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg, Maryland, Sarah, who entered in 1827, living to be nearly one hundred years old. Daniel Barber did not become a Catholic until some time later. He resigned his charge as minister at Claremont on November 13, 1818, and spent most of his last years after the death of his wife (1825) at the Jesuit houses in Maryland, dying at St. Inigoes in 1834.

Virgil Barber made his theological studies at Georgetown, and on February 2, 1820, he and his wife met again in the convent chapel, their terms of probation over, to make their vows, he as a Jesuit novice and she as a Visitation nun. Their five children

were present. He was ordained priest, in Boston, by Bishop Cheverus, on December 3, 1822, and went back to Claremont, New Hampshire, to work for the conversion of his former companions and neighbors. He built a small church adjoining his father's house and opened a school which soon became very popular. In addition he also acted as missionary among the Penobscot and Passamaquoddy Indians in Maine. In 1839 he returned to Georgetown and died there in 1847.

Samuel Joseph Barber, his son, after his collegiate studies at Georgetown, also became a Jesuit, taking his vows on August 15, 1832. He was then eighteen years old. During the same summer he was sent to Rome and remained abroad eight years, being ordained priest before his return. He filled with ability many positions in the several communities of the Society and died, aged fifty years, at St. Thomas' Manor, Maryland, February 23, 1864.

Mrs. Virgil Barber had received an excellent education and was a woman of tireless energy and zeal. Her addition to the teaching force of the Visitation Convent was of special advantage. She taught the children's classes during the day and in the evening drilled the other nuns in methods of teaching and in the branches in which they were deficient. She was in time made directress and under her management the reputation of the school steadily increased. The community, however, was very poor and she had many a sore hour trying to find the means to make her own four growing daughters comfortable and presentable. She remained at Georgetown until 1836, when she was sent to the convent at Kaskaskia, Illinois, remaining there until 1844. Then after a short stay at St. Louis, Missouri, she was transferred to the Mobile, Alabama, convent and taught there until her death, January 1, 1860.

Her four daughters followed her example and all became nuns. Mary, the eldest, joined the Ursulines in the Charlestown, Massachusetts, convent, August 15, 1826. She was there when that convent was sacked and burned by the anti-Catholic mob in 1834, and after this went with the other members of the community to Quebec, where she died, May 9, 1868. Her sister Abigail entered this Quebec convent and died March 2, 1879, after fifty-one years spent within its cloister. Susan, the third daughter, joined the Ursuline community at Three Rivers, Canada, May 21, 1830,

and lived until January 24, 1837. Josephine, the last of the daughters, and the baby who was entrusted to Mrs. Fenwick when her parents separated to enter on their religious life, went with Susan to the Ursuline Convent near Boston in 1827, but soon after returned to Georgetown where her mother was and entered that Visitation community. In 1833 she went out to Kaskaskia with other Sisters to found that convent. On her way she stopped at Frederick, Maryland, where she saw her father for the last time. When her mother was taken ill at the Mobile convent, she went there and remained with her until her death. She died herself in the St. Louis convent in 1888, after more than sixty years spent as a nun.

In the history of the Church all over the world it is not believed that a parallel can be cited for this extraordinary record—a family of seven entering religious life—the father and son becoming Jesuit priests; the mother and four daughters, Visitation and Ursuline nuns. And it all began at No. 24 Vesey Street, back of Old St. Peter's.

Bibliography: Shea, "Life and Times of Archbishop Carroll"; Hassard, "Life of Archbishop John Hughes"; De Goesbriand, "Catholic Memoirs of Vermont and New Hampshire"; Bennett, "Catholic Footsteps in Old New York"; Barrett, "Old Merchants of New York." Some of the material for the "Tales" has been compiled from contributions to *America*.

THE GENERAL MEETING

HELD ON THE EVENING OF MAY 9, 1927

A very delightful evening was afforded the members of the United States Catholic Historical Society and their guests, at the annual meeting which was held in the ball-room of the Catholic Club, on May 9. His Eminence Cardinal Hayes, honorary president, and for years one of the most active members of the society, presided. Percy J. King, the president, welcomed the Society and its guests and recalled the foundation of the Society and its first president, Dr. Richard H. Clarke, which occurred forty-three years ago. The presidents who followed Dr. Clarke, he said, were Frederick R. Coudert, Dr. John Gilmary Shea, Dr. Charles G. Herbermann, Stephen Farrelly and Dr. John G. Coyle. Mr. King said that the Society had the approbation of both Cardinal Farley and Cardinal Hayes who had signified their interest by becoming honorary presidents.

Thirty-one volumes have been printed by the Society: ten of the "Monograph Series" and twenty-one of the HISTORICAL RECORDS AND STUDIES," the official publication of the Society.

Among the volumes issued are "Unpublished Letters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton," a book now sought after by collectors; "The History of St. Joseph's Seminary, Troy; "The History of St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie"; "The History of the Diocese of Norfolk, Virginia," by Dr. Guilday; "The History of Bishop David and the Nazareth Sisters of Charity"; "The Diary of the Rev. Augustin J. Thebaud," a review of men and events in the last half of the Nineteenth Century and the "Cosmographia" of Waldsee Müller (in fac simile) containing the earliest map and the use of the term "America" and the "Diary of the Visit of Lord Charles Russell."

In the RECORDS AND STUDIES are many Church histories; biographies of prominent Catholics, laymen and clergy; pamphlets and volumes on the early history of Catholicism in New York; Records of Brooklyn and Manhattan; Memoirs of Governor Dongan, Edward Cavanagh, Father De Smet and John Mullanphy, a

noted character in the Middle West; Catholic officers of the United States Navy; United States Ministers to the Pope; History of the Capuchin Order in America; the Life of John Gilmary Shea and Memoirs of Judge William Gaston, the Catholic champion of toleration in North Carolina. One thousand copies of the official publications of the Society were circulated among the members and public libraries and educational institutions during the year.

Mr. King bespoke the urgent support of all the members and friends of the organization in forwarding the great work for which it had been founded and to which its efforts had been directed.

The list of the deceased members was then read and Mr. King stated that a minute would be made upon the records noting the regret of their fellow members at their passing from association with the Society. Those who had died during the year were: Louis V. O'Donohue, John P. O'Connor, Archbishop Denis O'Connell, B. T. Kearns, K. Beeter, Frank J. Goodwin, Gus V. R. Meehan, Mgr. Joseph Rainer, George B. Robinson, Duc de Loubat, Stuart P. West, Mgr. F. G. Holweck.

The following new members had been elected during the year: Hon. Alfred M. Barrett, Flushing, L. I.; Hon. Eugene F. Kinkead, Newark, N. J.; Richard H. Clarke, John E. Donnelly, Arthur B. Cuddihy, Dr. John E. Condon, Rev. J. J. Murphy, Michael Blake, Cornelius J. Carroll, Rev. F. E. Tourscher, Villa Nova Library, The Salvatorian Fathers, Wisconsin; Mrs. Ellen Brophy, Los Angeles; Boston College, Mass.; Mr. C. J. Thorburn, Virginia; Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Coakley, Pittsburgh; Miss Harriet Self, New York; Rev. Wilfrid Parsons, S.J., Capuchin Fathers, New York City; Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. Francis C. Kelley, Oklahoma.

Mr. King then introduced Rev. Dr. Peter Guilday, Professor of History of the Catholic University, who spoke as follows on John England, Bishop of Charleston and Catholic champion of the United States:

The Right Reverend John England, first Bishop of Charleston, South Carolina, was born at Cork, Ireland, on September 23, 1786. He was the eldest of ten children. One brother, Thomas England, became a priest and died in 1847, as parish priest of

Passage, near Cork, after having published several excellent biographies, the best known of which is his "Life of Arthur O'Leary," the celebrated Franciscan. Their youngest sister, Joanna, came to South Carolina with Bishop England and died there during the yellow fever epidemic of 1827. John England attended one of the non-Catholic schools of his native city, and after reaching what we should call high-school age entered a barrister's office to study law. These legal studies came to an end two years later; and in 1802 he matriculated in St. Patrick's College, Carlow, to prepare for the priesthood. Six years later, on October 11, 1808, he was ordained priest by his Ordinary, Bishop Francis Moylan, the brother of General Stephen Moylan, Commissary-General of the Continental Army during the American Revolution. The next twelve years of his life (1808-1820) were spent in the city of Cork and in the town of Bandon about sixteen miles away. He has summed up for us in a letter to Bishop Conwell of Philadelphia (September 18, 1822) the various duties which he performed at that time:

"During that period [he writes], I successively held the following situations, all the duties of which I regularly discharged: the Chaplaincy of the city prisons; that of the Presentation Convent of Nuns for the education of poor children; that of the Magdalen Asylum; the lecturship of the Cathedral; the superintendence of the diocesan seminary, and teacher of philosophy and theology therein; inspector of the poor schools of the city, which contained upwards of two thousand boys; and secretary to the Fever Hospital; and was on the committee of several charitable institutions. Many of these situations I held together, and was during the entire period secretary to the diocese, and secretary to the Board of Examiners of Candidates for Holy Orders."

The result of these twelve years of active ministry in pastoral and educational work and especially of his participation in the Veto controversy between 1812-1817 was that he came to America in 1820, better equipped with an accurate knowledge of the condition of political and ecclesiastical affairs in Ireland and in Europe, than most of his contemporaries in the United States. The men with whom he had been brought into personal contact were among the greatest intellectual leaders Ireland has ever seen. Their profound theological learning, their hold upon the canonical

teaching of the Church, their unflinching stand in matters of religion and, above all, their love of liberty and their determined attitude on emancipation from British overlordship—these he imbibed to such a degree that there were blended in his mind and heart all those qualities of churchman and of citizen which rendered him the pride of his co-religionists in the United States.

Two remarkable proofs are given in his correspondence of his popularity in Ireland at the time he was sent to preside over the Church in the Southland of the new Republic. When he was leaving Ireland, he received from the friends of civil and religious liberty in the parish of Bandon a public dinner, the presiding officer of which was a Presbyterian. After his consecration, a banquet was given in his honor in the City of Cork, and to this "public entertainment" there came "some of the richest and most independent public-spirited members of other religious denominations. After he had reached Charleston, he was made the subject of an enthusiastic resolution at an aggregate meeting held in Cork on April 2, 1821, the words of which run as follows:

"That the chairman be requested to convey, in the warmest manner, to the Rt. Rev. Dr. England, our unabated admiration of his patriotic and powerful exertions in favour of Ireland whilst among us, and our fervent prayer for the success of his endeavours in the cause of religion and humanity in the free country where he now resides."

The politico-religious school of the Veto and anti-Veto controversy developed John England's character better than anything else for the great field of labor that lay across the Atlantic. His share in the celebrated Veto question has placed his name side by side with the English Athanasius, John Milner. His successful fight against the Irish Concordat places him second only to Daniel O'Connell. As early as 1813, Father England was publicly applauded at a great gathering of Catholics in Cork for his stand against the British Government and was presented with a chalice, which may still be seen in Charleston, around the base of which runs the legend: "*Revd Joanni England: donum civium Catholicorum, indefessum erga Patriam fortunatumque laborem admirantium.*"

There is an unknown page in his career about the end of the

year 1816, for we find him writing to the Sacred Congregation de Propaganda Fide, volunteering for the missions in the Diocese of New York. There is a letter from Bishop Connolly offering him a modest salary and the post of assistant at St. Peter's in Barclay Street and wishing him a "speedy and agreeable voyage hither." Bishop Murphy of Cork was unwilling to release him and in May, 1817, appointed him to the vacant parish of Bandon. It was here in July, 1820, that Father England learned of his election to the new See of the Carolinas and Georgia. In one of the letters of the day he is styled by Cardinal-Prefect of Propaganda Fide— "*il più bravo, il più dotto, il più eloquente de tutto il clero d' Irlanda.*" On August 12, 1820, he received the apostolic briefs of his appointment; on the twenty-fifth, he resigned his parish and fixed upon September 21, as the day of his consecration. He left us in his *Diurnal* and in his writings but few indications of what his feelings then were from the standpoint of one who had reached national fame in the politico-ecclesiastical controversies of the time at thus being sent from his own people to a land across the seas not yet a half-century old in the parliament of nations. That there were those who saw in his elevation to the Charleston See the means of exiling from Ireland one of the staunchest advocates of non-interference on the part of the Government in Church affairs, can be seen in a somewhat extravagant paragraph from Fagan's "Life of Daniel O'Connell":

"The principal mover in the whole of this democratic insurrection against aristocratic pretensions in Cork, was the celebrated Dr. England. He was a man of great powers of mind, amazing intellectual energy; possessing, too, a masculine eloquence, and a stern, unflinching determination, well suited to a popular leader. . . . He was, from the first, a decided anti-Vetoist. Indeed, we may affirm, he was the guiding genius of the anti-Quarantotti movement. . . . Why was it that Ireland afterwards lost the services of that distinguished man? Why was his lot ultimately cast in a foreign land—in the Southern States of republican America, where his genius burned out amid a race of uncivilized slave owners? He sacrificed himself to the service of religion, but would he not have rendered it more service as a prelate in his native land, co-operating with such able and exalted men as Dr. Doyle in improving the condition of the people and making Catholicity respected even by its enemies? The endowments of a mind like his were partly lost in the semi-barbarous sphere of Charleston, and those Southern States of America of which he became

Bishop. The boundless regions of the far West presented opportunities too few for the exercise of those accomplishments and gifts with which he was enriched. Religion might be propagated by intellectually inferior agencies. Amongst the busy, money-loving, pre-occupied, and scattered sojourners in those wild, half-settled territories, one mind, however masculine and energetic, could accomplish little. His profound learning, his theological acquirements fell upon a barren soil—though, as the result has proved, from their intrinsic vigor, they took root and flourished

"It is to Ireland that as teachers of religion, as the instructors of humbler missionaries, such as Dr. England, should be assigned. It was, therefore, always a source of deep regret in after days that circumstances, we believe of a private nature, suggested his appointment to the episcopacy in America. He who broke down the Veto spirit in Cork, would have rendered invaluable services in the various subsequent struggles for civil liberty and social and political amelioration. For his was a master-mind; and it was on such a stage as society in Ireland offered that his noble and various attributes would have found material and room for action."

John England was consecrated Bishop of Charleston September 21, 1820, in the Cathedral of St. Finnbarr, Cork, by Bishop Murphy of that See. The co-consecrators were Bishop Kelly of Richmond, Virginia (who had been consecrated at Kilkenny on August 24, 1820), and Bishop Moran of Ossory. The assisting prelates were Archbishop Bray of Cashel, his coadjutor, Archbishop Everard, and Bishops Coppinger, Shugrue and Tuohy. Three days later Bishop England ordained his first two priests, and on October 22, 1820, the little party, which included his youngest sister, Joanna, set sail on the *Thomas Gelston* for Charleston. In the evening of December 27, the harbor of Charleston was sighted, and on Saturday, December 30, they came ashore and were met by Father Fenwick, S. J., Vicar-General of the Southland under Archbishop Maréchal. Bishop England presented his official papers to the future Bishop of Boston and formally took possession of his See the following day at his first pontifical High Mass.

To appreciate the problems that confronted the first Bishop of Charleston in 1820, it would be necessary to give a general survey of the Catholic history of his diocese up to that time. This survey should include: a retrospect from the earliest settlement of the

Carolinas and Georgia to the year of Archbishop Carroll's death (1815); the origin and development of the schism which threatened the Southland under the jurisdiction of Archbishop Neale (1815-17); the efforts of Archbishop Maréchal to control the insubordinate groups in the chief cities of the future Diocese of Charleston; and finally, Dr. England's initial reconstruction of the shattered discipline of the Church in that territory. But to enter into any one or into all of these phases of Bishop England's diocesan problems, even in a cursory way, would carry us too far afield. He had only three priests and three churches and about five of what we would call today congregations. His flock, small as it was, had passed from disobedience to insubordination and from rebellion to a secret attempt to set up an "Independent Catholick Church" with a bishop who was to receive consecration from the Jansenist Bishop of Utrecht.

Out of all that might be said however on Bishop England's methods of reconstruction in the two Carolinas and Georgia, we should not pass over his Constitution of the Diocese. In spite of the known opposition of Archbishop Maréchal and of some of the other bishops, chiefly Dr. Conwell of Philadelphia, he planned and carried to completion what may well be styled the first Catholic Welfare Conference in the United States. The Constitution is divided into seven *tituli* or titles: on doctrine, ecclesiastical government, Church property, trusteeship, the annual meeting, the method of assembly, and the procedure to be followed. Each of the three States was divided into districts, placed under the patronage of a Saint, and each district was again divided into parochial units. With the district meetings held at intervals during the year, and with the annual convention of the priests and laity in each State from 1823 to 1839, Bishop England had a means of organizing the Catholic activities of his diocese upon an efficient basis that has not been excelled since his day. The problems brought before the Conventions were similar in many respects to those which have occupied the minds of our prelates ever since: Catholic education; clerical training; social welfare work among the poor and the laboring class; legislation and defense of Catholic moral principles; Catholic literature; and the Bible Society; the Society of St. John the Baptist, which he founded in 1822; the Sisters of Mercy; the Ursulines; the Philo-

sophical and Ecclesiastical Seminary of Charleston; the Catholic Bible Society; the Society of St. John the Baptist, which he modeled on the Society of the Propagation of the Faith of Lyons-Paris; and especially his labor union, the Brotherhood of San Marino, these are some of the practical benefits of his general welfare conventions. To read Dr. England's annual addresses before these assemblies is to know the intimate story of the social and religious life of the South during the twenty-two years he was Bishop of Charleston (1820-1842). One note dominates, the necessity of rearing Catholic youth in the best spirit of American idealism, and the necessity of a native clergy, not trained as he believed the young aspirants to the priesthood were being trained under French Sulpician influence, but brought into contact with American ways and customs and imbued with high and noble love for the American republic. To use his own words, he desiderated a body of priests, who would join to sound faith, tried virtue, and extensive knowledge, "an attachment to our republican institutions, men who could be easily assimilated to the climate, and feel that they are, as it were, a part of the country itself."

In many respects the story of his episcopate is unique in our Catholic history. At the end of his life there were Catholic congregations in every important social and commercial center of the three States under his jurisdiction. The number of priests had grown and his people had thrown off the miserable fears which almost two centuries of colonial legislation had created in the land. His success was extraordinary; and among the causes of that success, viewing it in a purely human way, was the co-operation he received from many not of the household of the Faith. From Charleston to Savannah, to Columbia and Sumter, to Raleigh, Fayetteville, Wilmington and Newbern, almost at every stopping-place, Bishop England was met by committees of Protestants, usually headed by the Protestant ministers of these cities, towns and hamlets, who begged him to stay over and to preach to their people the Word of God. Protestant ministers vied with one another in offering him their pulpits; and often Dr. England remained in these places long enough to preach in the Presbyterian, Methodist and Episcopalian churches. In some localities, it was the Protestant minister who sought out those

who were known or suspected to be Catholics and who brought them to the services.

There was religious argument and controversy as a matter of course, for people believed in religion in those days; and many an hour was passed with non-Catholics over mooted points of doctrine. But everywhere Bishop England met with the respect due his exalted office. He had preached in so many Protestant churches, court-houses, schools, and private homes of non-Catholics, that to him there was nothing extraordinary in the invitation sent to him in January, 1826, to preach before Congress. This sermon, one of two and a half hours in length, may be taken as the beginning of his public defense of the Catholic Church. The House of Representatives was crowded that Sunday morning, and the assembly was honored by the presence of President John Quincy Adams who came to hear him. No important point of controversy raised by Protestant American apologists was avoided: the meaning of religion; man's duty to worship God; the obligation of searching after God's truth; papal infallibility; the medieval papal dispensing power; and the current objection to Catholicism as an aristocratic, if not despotic, religion, opposed in spirit to republican views, and therefore not calculated to be favorable to American progress.

It is evident from the interest created by the press notices of Bishop England's sermon before Congress, that the whole of his discourse was carefully scrutinized by all whose fears had been aroused through the charge that the Catholic religion was detrimental to the progress of republican ideals. Misrepresentations of the Catholic religion on this score were being industriously propagated in England and in America, especially through the attack made by the renegade priest, Blanco White. In May, 1826, the Catholic bishops of England felt obliged to present to the British public in answer to White a concise statement of Catholic belief. "They had flattered themselves," the statement runs, "that the numerous and uniform expositions of their religious doctrines, given in public professions of the Catholic faith, in Catholic Catechisms, in various authentic documents, and in declarations confirmed by their solemn oaths, would have abundantly sufficed to correct all misrepresentations of their real tenets." The same non-Catholic attitude was visible in the United States at this

period. The charge of a double allegiance limiting Catholic loyalty to the government formed the basis of every issue of numerous journals emanating from non-Catholic ranks. Blanco White's "Practical and Internal Evidences Against Catholicism" was published in an American reprint in 1826, at Georgetown, D. C., and the book was recommended as "a temperate and able exposition of the errors of Popery," by a group of thirty-two Protestant ministers, who, headed by Bishop James Kemp, signed their names to the public a volume. "B. C.," who is John, Bishop of Charleston, answered Blanco White's book in detail in the *Catholic Miscellany* from 1826 to 1828, exposing the fallacies of the volume.

Apparently, the storm which these Protestant American religious journals were endeavoring to arouse in the country was not to be allayed by even such an honest and eloquent exposition of Catholic doctrine as that given by Dr. England in the House of Representatives. One factor in the conflict was undeniable: the official manifestation of the American Protestant attitude towards the increasing power of Catholicism in this country was not met officially by the leaders of the Church here. It was not supineness, nor was it spiritual lethargy, but inability on the part of Archbishop Maréchal and the hierarchy of the day to understand that the attack upon the Church was the most serious and best organized of any since the early days of the Protestant Revolt. That the exclusion of Catholics from a voice in national and civil affairs, to which the whole movement was to tend until the decade prior to the Civil War, was not wholly successful, is not due to the first generation of our bishops, who thought it best to allow individual scholars like Dr. England, to attract to themselves the brunt of the Protestant-Catholic quarrel of these decades. In one of his later letters, Dr. England wrote an epitaph for the period: "Fighting in Detached Squads."

From this time (1826), until his death sixteen years later, Bishop England was recognized by Catholics and Protestants as the foremost champion of the Catholic Faith. His principal works were issued during these years, and in practically everything he wrote, one idea is made clear over and over, the harmony that exists between our democratic American institutions and the doctrines of the Catholic Church.

The Reynolds edition of his "Works," published in 1849, con-

sisted of five volumes. The edition published in 1908 under the supervision of Archbishop Messmer of Milwaukee, consists of seven volumes and is divided into six parts: Doctrinal Works; Controversy; Historical Writings; Essays; Occasional Letters; and Addresses. Seventy-seven separate titles exhibit the wide range of Dr. England's scholarship. Not all these papers merit the attention of present-day readers, since the causes and circumstances of their composition have little contemporary value; but there are passages in practically all his longer essays which deserve to be known, not only because of their clarity and logic but because the problems they consider are of constant interest to American Catholics. Generally speaking, all Dr. England's writings during the twenty-two years of his episcopate belong to the literature created by the anti-Catholic movements of this epoch. Having once entered a controversy he never faltered and never yielded his post. It was a day when no quarter was asked or expected between controversialists; and the mass of libellous invective against the Church was in reality so large in comparison to the whole content of the American press of the day that some one had to throw himself into the breach. In this regard, Dr. England's twenty years of editorship would have been enough work for one man.

One of the significant facts in any estimate of John England's works is that, in spite of the conditions under which he prepared these doctrinal, historical, liturgical, and classical papers, conditions which forced a swift gathering of sources and a rapid marshalling of facts into shape for the final draft of his composition, there is a remarkable absence of repetition. A second factor is the range of source-material he used. We have no means of knowing what his library consisted of, for the fire of 1861 destroyed the bishop's house and the seminary. There is frequent mention of the purchase of books in his letters, and it is known that he brought an exceptionally select library of books with him to Charleston in 1820. During his four journeys to Europe, the purchase of books always occupied a goodly share of his time and attention, and he had all the scholar's anxiety about their safe arrival in America. A third aspect of his work is its scholarliness. Writing in an age when the reader did not as a general rule question the sources from which the narrative was

constructed, Dr. England never fails to mention the volumes he consulted, and his references are always given with accuracy and fullness. Naturally this added strength to his pages in such controversies as those he carried on with Bowen, Smith, Hawley, Bachmann, Waddell, Fuller, and other Protestant ministers, all of whom had received a classical and theological training of no mean kind.

His first publication was his "Pastoral Letter" of January 21, 1821, a month after his arrival in Charleston, announcing his taking possession of his See. His last was his "Address on American Citizenship," given at Boston on May 14, 1841, on his way to Europe for the last time. Among these seventy odd publications some were short, such as his letter to Bishop David, "On the Definition of Faith," while others were veritable books in length. Among these are: "The Republic in Danger" which occupies 100 pages in his printed Works; the "Roman Chancery," with 166 pages; "The Catholic Doctrine of Transubstantiation," his controversy with the Rev. Dr. Bachman, which covers 231 pages; and his "Letters to Rev. Dr. Bowen on 'A Protestant Catechism'," with 305 pages. The largest of his writings is the "Letters on the Calumnies of J. Blanco White against the Catholic Religion, Addressed to the Roman Catholics of the United States," which occupy 442 pages of the Messmer edition.

In the history of the revival of religious intolerance, the period from 1820 to 1850 stands out in a startling vividness. The steady current of distrust towards Catholicism as a theology, a spiritual force, and as a polity in national affairs, had its rise in the century which preceded the coming of the Adventurers to Virginia and Massachusetts. Outside of Maryland for a few decades after the founding of that colony, and to a certain extent outside of Pennsylvania, Catholicism or papistry was an object of constant legal surveillance in the charters and statutes of the colonies. Some of the colonies, however, made distinct progress towards the abolition of legal religious repression between the close of the Revolution and the adoption of the Constitution; but it must not be forgotten that it was not until 1844 that the last of the colonies or States along the Atlantic Coast accepted the religious liberty embodied in the American Constitution.

There was considerable debate over the extent of the religious

freedom guaranteed by the Constitution when it came before the States for adoption; but there was no difficulty in accepting it, since its main purpose was to assert a policy of non-interference in religious affairs by the Federal Government. Theoretically, the restrictions of the first amendment were not binding upon the individual States. Each State had the right to make laws for the establishment of religion within its borders; but eventually in practice, none deemed it prudent to exercise that right. The principle of religious freedom found its way immediately into some of the State Constitutions; into others it took time before certain disabilities directed against Catholic citizens were entirely removed.

There are several ways of explaining the weary persistence of religious intolerance in the development of the United States. Naturally and logically to many Catholic writers the pages of our national history which contain evidences of social and political proscription, practiced against the members of their Church, bear but one interpretation: hatred on the part of many Protestants for the ancient Faith of Rome. To other students of American social history, the explanation is sought in the racial antagonism of the Anglo-Saxon towards all foreigners and especially towards the Irish who were for so many years after the founding of the new Republic the principal element in the growth of the nation by immigration. So many confusing factors enter into what might be called the Protestant attitude towards Catholicism that it is practically useless to attempt anything like a logical analysis of that prejudice. In some sections where it was a highly tinged industrial animosity, it had a specious justification on economic grounds.

In other parts of the country, particularly in the growing cities of the East, this prejudice was partly social and partly political; and here again, a calm examination of all the aspects of the anti-Catholic spirit of some of our cities reveals causes within the Catholic ranks which could not fail to provoke misrepresentation and sturdy opposition. In intellectual centers, such as Princeton, New Haven, and Cambridge, the anti-Catholic viewpoint was of a different nature, and less likely to promote outbreaks of a violent kind. If we allow ourselves to make the conclusion that the abettors of this violence enter into the causal elements of

this anti-Catholic spirit, then to the ministry of certain Protestant Churches, and particularly to the Presbyterian ministry, must the charge be laid that, without the fanaticism they deliberately engendered by their speeches, sermons, and published articles, the malice and hatred of the mobs which enacted so much violence would not have blackened the fair name of American justice and liberty.

American Calvinism hated the Church of Rome with an uncommon hatred during the first fifty years of the nineteenth century. Rev. Lyman Beecher in Boston; Rev. Brownlee in New York; Rev. Robert J. Breckinridge in Baltimore; Rev. Richard Fuller in Beaufort, South Carolina, are among the outstanding names in any history of the movement. To these clergymen might be added many in every part of the United States who believed, and probably with sincerity, that the future prosperity of the nation was being jeopardized by the increasing power, influence and numerical strength of the Catholic Church.

If the causes, however, for this hostility are so varied and so sectional in character that an accurate synthesis is almost unobtainable, the effort of Protestant intolerance is so objective in its undisguised purpose that there need be no hesitancy in acknowledging it. That purpose was the extermination of Catholicism in the country and the control of the government through political methods for the Protestantizing of the American people.

From this standpoint, the works of Dr. England which merit our attention are: "Letters to Dr. Bowen," Protestant Episcopal Bishop of South Carolina, written in 1828; "Letters on the Calumnies of J. Blanco White against the Catholic Religion, addressed to the Roman Catholics of the United States," begun in 1826 and finished in 1828; and his "Republic in Danger," a series of letters written in 1831. These three works are a skilful and masterly refutation of the theme then current in the Protestant press, "Republicanism and Catholicism bear no affinity in any one single relation, nor can they ever cordially unite in character." This slogan crystallizes almost all the phases of all the anti-Catholic movements in the United States. The various elements involved, political, racial, industrial, and religious, found in this rallying cry the clearest exposition of their fears of Catholicism. In the Hughes-Breckinridge debate in 1833 and in the Purcell-

Campbell debate of 1837, the problem was the same, "Is the Roman Catholic Religion, in any or all its principles or doctrines, inimical to civil or religious liberty?"

"Would that we had to do with antagonists," exclaims Dr. England in one of his stirring pages, "who would print only the truth! But the torture, the affliction of being perpetually occupied in an Augean stable, in which all the imported falsehoods of European writers are deposited!"

The answer he gives to the charge that the Catholic Church, believing in a union of Church and States, was striving to control the American Republic, was that the Protestant bodies, in particular the Methodist and Presbyterian, were guilty of a crowning inconsistency in their own action by trying to do secretly the very thing they openly condemned. Dr. England answered the charge as follows: "There is not on earth a body of clergy who have uniformly endeavoured to create this union in their own person with more steady energy than those of one of the Protestant communities."

Rev. William Hawley clarified the charge of un-Americanism against the Catholic Church in a letter written to Dr. England in July, 1831:

"1. A Roman Catholic can be *in principle* a faithful subject of a Protestant government, only when *an unfaithful subject of the Pope*.

"2. A consistent Papist, and a dutiful subject of a Protestant administration, must be incompatible, so long as the Pope shall claim jurisdiction over all Christendom, and the Roman Church shall continue to maintain that faith is not necessary to be kept with heretics.

"3. The only reason why, among Papists, there are many good subjects of the Protestant governments, arises from the fact, that there are so many in the Roman Church inconsistent with their profession, better than their profession, having no idea of all the doctrines and all the erroneous corruptions of the faith they acknowledge."

Dr. England lost patience when such statements came from a clergyman who was then chaplain to the United States Senate; and in several columns of unimpeachable sarcasm he brought out into historic relief the opposition between Hawley's statements and the very essence of American freedom, which abhorred such re-

ligious slavery as that expressed in Hawley's words: "Whoever will not be a Protestant under a Protestant government is a traitor!" A paragraph from Dr. England's answer will suffice to show the general treatment he accords the chaplain:

"I am proud of America, because America not only disavows, but condemns that principle of Slavery. It is a heresy in religion; it is an absurdity in politics, to assert that because a man possesses political powers, therefore, he possesses ecclesiastical jurisdiction; or that because he has spiritual power, he and the Constitution are in union upon this subject. The doctrines of the Roman Catholic Church and the principles of the American Constitution are in unison upon this subject. The doctrines of the Church of England and the principles of our Constitution are in direct opposition upon the subject. And if you adopt the doctrine of the English Church, you are not good citizens of America. In framing the religion of which you are clergymen, it became necessary to reject some doctrines of the English Church. Her liturgy was mutilated; and canons made useless; and a vast portion of the homilies are blasphemies against our liberties. And is it possible that you still cling to all that has been thus rejected?"

At this stage of a controversy which had attracted the attention of official Washington, Dr. England gave the doctrine on this phase of Church and State as explained by Catholic theologians; namely, that God never gave to any Pope, nor to any other bishop, nor to any other clergyman, nor to any human tribunal, any power, directly or indirectly, to inflict any corporal or temporal punishment upon man for heresy or religious error. He did give the Church, and of course to the Bishops who compose her tribunal, a power to cut off delinquents by excommunication, a power to censure, to deprive of spiritual authority, to refuse the sacraments and such like. But He never gave to the Church any other power of punishment.

Bishop England was to find, however, to his own constant amazement that no disavowal, howsoever solemnly worded, could influence the Protestant mind on this subject: There is much in habit, he tells Hawley in conclusion:

"The people of America have been accustomed to find Roman Catholics treated in the same manner that you have treated us. But, sirs, if I were to write of Protestants as you have written of Catholics, would any vituperation be considered too gross. You deserve worse treatment than you have received. I have been too lenient, too sparing. But should it be necessary for me to

take you up again, I do not calculate upon such forbearance. I stand in America upon an equality of right with you; and though I have against me vast prejudice, for which the people of America are not to blame: I have to contend in presence of a discerning, intelligent, patient, investigating people who love truth and will neither strike me down by the hand of power, nor drown my voice in clamour. They are not like the British Parliament, who put the lock of the law upon the mouth of truth."

The peak of Bishop England's controversial writings was reached in his "Letters on the Calumnies of J. Blanco White." His exposé of White's religious and moral life both as a priest and an apostate was merciless. White's "Evidences" were written to prevent the passage of the Act of Emancipation. His argument was that if Catholics were ever readmitted to Parliament, they would be obliged by the very nature of their allegiance to Rome to destroy Protestantism in the British Isles. The inference was that if British Catholics were to be vested with any sort of political power, they would be obliged to obey the Pope, should they be commanded to stop the progress of Protestantism. White's book was calculated, therefore, to create distrust in Catholic candidates for public office in the United States; and Dr. England accused Bishop Kemp and his associates of having that object in view in stimulating the sale of the book.

The whole series of letters turns about this question: the alleged intolerance of the Catholic Church. Partial citations from these letters would give but an inadequate idea of the cogency of Dr. England's reasoning or of the profound knowledge of historical theology he displays in his answers. What he pleads for most is a fair hearing: "I wish to meet the opponents of my church openly and plainly upon fair ground, before the American public. Before that tribunal I love to plead: for although the current of public feeling is strongly running against my side of the question, I know that if I can once get the mind of America to examine the case fully and fairly, I shall have ample justice."

What is of importance to us of these latter days in our estimate of his "Letters" on Blanco White is not alone the answers given by Bishop England to the charges made rather recklessly against the Church, but the fact that for the first time in the history of the South Protestant polemics met a formidable aggressor in the

Bishop of Charleston. The general impression at the time was that Catholics had everything to gain and nothing to lose by public controversy of this kind.

Bishop England's theory was that prejudice against the Church would be lessened if Protestants were to abstain from using terms of reproach and insidious epithets. The very name, he states, through erroneous, by which we first designate a real or supposed enemy, so strongly prepossesses the mind that no subsequent facts can erase the impression as long as the first error is persisted in; and as an example of the lack of appreciation of such terms, he cites the hated word "Papist" as the chief offender in a hostile phraseology which many once used without realizing its offensiveness. His strongest hope for the lessening of prejudice was in the sober-minded citizens of non-Catholic faiths who realized the inherent danger there was to all religious freedom in the continuance of the attacks upon the Catholic Church. This hope he based upon the fact that while Catholic leaders in the country were strangely silent in the midst of all the abuse of these years, proposals were being made by Protestants to found a "Society of the Protection of Religious Liberty," into which all might come who were desirous of preserving toleration in religious matters and especially all those Protestants who feared the possibility of a Calvinist success in creating a union between their Church and the government.

His "Republic in Danger" contains an historical account of the origin of these unpleasant nicknames: AntiChrist, Papist, Beast, Babylon, Romanist, Romish, Popish, Scarlet Woman, Mother of Harlots, and others which were in the common parlance of even educated Protestants of those days when speaking of the Catholic Church. Here and there in these essays are passages of incomparable beauty, filled with pathos appealing to non-Catholic Americans not to disfigure the first pages of our national history with fratricidal religious strife. In one place Dr. England recalls the address of the Catholics presented to Washington in 1790 and the reply of the immortal leader. Charles Carroll of Carrollton, who had signed that address, was still living when Dr. England wrote the following lines:

"One of the Catholics who subscribed that address, and who received that answer, yet survives. Isolated in his grandeur, he

raises his modest head amidst the graves of all his companions, linking together the past and the present generations; all the affections which we would transmit to the venerable fathers of our republic converge in him, and through him are conducted to them; well has his life been devoted to the practice of virtue, nobly has his fortune been pledged for the benefits of myriads yet unborn; he has seen nearly a century pass away, and his honour is yet untarnished and sacred. And will America permit his departure to be embittered by the proclamation, that because of his profession and practice of the religion of the Alfreds, of the Augustines, of the Dorias, of the Tells, of the Ambroses, of the Fenelons, of the vindicators of Magna Charta, of the heralds of Christianity, of the discoverers of this continent; that because, he is a member of that Church which preserved literature and civilized the world, the venerable Charles Carroll shall be classed with the most degraded portion of our sots by unappeasable and domineering bigotry? Yet, is not this the effort which is made?"

The final letter of the series on the "Republic in Danger" is well worth the perusal of those who wisely seek in Bishop England's writings guidance for contemporary problems of a similar kind which disturb or distract present-day religious peace in the United States. One passage has such an opposite value that it deserves to be cited:

"My Friends:—I am desirous of closing this series of letters. I have trespassed upon your patience and been tedious in exhibiting evidence to prove that of which most of you have been long convinced, viz., that the evangelicals complained that under the pretext of placing men of good principles in civil office, they were not permitted to exclude from all places of public honour, public trust, and public emolument, all men who did not belong to their party. Thus they sought to monopolize the stations of government to the exclusion of infidels, of Papists, and of the ungodly and the heterodox, that is, they aim at a practical violation of the constitution of the United States. The rabid fury with which they assail Roman Catholics is abundant evidence of their disposition. The moment any member of that Church is chosen to any office worth naming, that instant he and his church are villanously outraged; laboured and polished essays, and vile and vulgar contumely are flung abroad amongst the public, and you are called upon to protect your endangered liberties. These productions are seen in Europe, they are noticed in Catholic nations, and our country is viewed by men of literature and of acquirements in not very flattering way. Yet, what care the evangelicals for this? Their object is to perpetuate ancient prejudices for their private emolument; and if they succeed, the public may indeed

hiss them, but they will applaud themselves. Hence they are reckless of the character of the nation, provided they possess the influence of power, or are able to count a large share of dollars in their stock."

In this same letter Dr. England prophesied that unless religious rancor abated in the nation, violence would undoubtedly be the outcome. This prophecy was to come true within a decade. He warned the Catholic public of the United States that ill-will and malignity were rising powerfully against them because of their increase in numbers and on account of their alleged political influence. He showed beyond all cavilling that there was in Protestant ministerial circles that settled design of degrading and disfranchising the Catholics of the nation.

How truly Dr. England measured the social effect of the Protestant attack upon the Catholic Faith can be seen vividly from our vantage of a century's retrospect. The crime at Charlestown, Massachusetts, in August, 1834, was followed by the "Awful Disclosures" of Maria Monk and the equally obscene production of Rebecca Reed. A veritable flood of abuse was poured upon Catholics in the decade of 1830-1840. "Popery" through the length and breadth of the land had become the watchword for intolerant attack. Though divided on every subject in any way connected with Protestant belief, nay, at odds even on what was fundamental to that religion, there was one point on which all Protestants could and did unite: the abuse of Catholics, their creed and their religious practices. The "fathers of Orthodoxy," as Dr. England ironically called them, contemplated not only the disenfranchisement of Catholics, but also the protection of the law for their plan of exclusion. The language employed by non-Catholics who participated in the politico-religious controversies of the period reached at times a bitterness that is unbelievable. As Bishop England saw the situation by the middle of the year 1836, there was no hope of continuing any longer the discussion of mooted doctrinal points, in what had become a great national religious debate, along the stately lines of the older contestants.

In opening the sixteenth volume of the *Catholic Miscellany* (July 9, 1836), Dr. England thus pictures the situation:

"There is one fact too notorious to be screened—that against

such of the citizens of these states, as profess the doctrines of our Church, there exists a feeling of, and in some cases a deadly, hostility. The assertion we know is a strong one—but common candour calls for it. No matter what may be the differences—and sometimes they are bitter enough,—that distract occasionally our separated brethren, whether they regard the canonicity of a particle of scripture or the translation of a word—the disbursement of the contents of the Missionary Carbons, or the thunders of an excommunication—or anything else whether for the heathen at home or abroad, still in denouncing Catholicity throughout the length and breadth of the land there is found a common ground upon which the discordant camps can meet and bend in amity. We have abundant evidence to support the remark: and should any individual betray the least symptom of incredulity, as to the truth of the fact, that Catholicity is all save formally proscribed in the great republic of modern days, let him only fix his eye on the blackened battlements of Mount Benedict, or peruse the envenomed effusions of the American Protestant press. Nor can the charge be honestly confined, as the phrase would suggest, to what is called the religious press of the Country; for we think we could make out the case, that the political press is to a considerable extent tinged with that tone of bigotry, which unfortunately but too signally marks the former. With politics we of course have nothing to do; who may be the successful candidate for any office in the gift of the people, as little; though as citizens of the United States, we reserve to ourselves the privilege of exercising when we think fit the rights belonging to such. We would only remark then that it is rather ominous to find the spirit of that press which should be the first to arrest the march of intolerance, teeming with the rancour of polemics, descending on the eve of an election for party purposes—to embitter a spirit which on such occasions is but too highly inflamed, by blending politics with religion.”

The following year (1837) the third Provincial Court of Baltimore was held, and at its close a “Pastoral” written by Bishop England, was published. There is a passage in this “Pastoral” which merits our highest attention since it contains what is undoubtedly one of the noblest answers ever made by a Catholic American to the charge of a divided loyalty:

“We owe no religious allegiance to any State in this Union, nor to its general government. No one of them claims any supremacy or dominion over us in our spiritual or ecclesiastical concerns; nor does it claim any such right or power over any of our fellow-citizens, nor would we submit thereto. They and we, by our con-

stitutional principles, are free to give this ecclesiastical supremacy to whom we please, or to refuse it to every one if we so think proper. But, they, and we, owe civil and political allegiance to the several States in which we reside, and also to our general government. When, therefore, using our undoubted right, we acknowledge the spiritual and ecclesiastical supremacy of the chief bishop of our universal church, the Pope of Rome, we do not thereby forfeit our claim to the civil and political protection of the commonwealth; for, we do not detract from the allegiance to which the temporal governments are plainly entitled, and which we cheerfully give; nor do we acknowledge any civil or political supremacy or power over us in any foreign potentate or power, though that potentate might be the chief pastor of our Church."

During these busy years, Bishop England visited Europe four times for the purpose of bringing the needs of his large diocese to the attention of the missionary societies of Lyons-Paris, Vienna, and Munich, as well as to that of his many friends in Ireland. Three years were largely spent in his Apostolic Delegation to the Island of Haiti. No bishop of the period kept his hand so firmly on the pulse of intolerance in this country, and running through many editorials of the *Miscellany* are to be found sturdy analyses of the current antipathy. One such merits to be read; it is the opening editorial in the eighteenth volume of the *Miscellany* (July 7, 1838):

"When we review our own special position as a religious body, the Catholics of these United States have reason for much congratulation. With only one miserable and insignificant exception (New Jersey), we are upon a perfect legal and constitutional equality with our fellow-citizens of other religious denominations. Would to God, we could say that they regard us with kindness, and speak of us with justice! . . . Yet though we be objects of hate to the bigot and of calumny to the evil speaker, we may fairly say, that we possess the confidence and sympathy of the majority of our fellow-citizens, and that the evil devices of our enemies have recoiled upon themselves. They found that the misrepresentation of our tenets, the libelling of our clergy; the destruction of our convents, the plundering of our poor labouring and industrious population, the insulting and disbanding of our volunteer companies, the procuration of parsons and of harlots to forge licentious fables—was not sufficient to draw down upon us the ruin which they desired! They have now recourse to an expedient, at least as old as the Christian religion, and of which the accusers of the Saviour gave example to the persecutors of the

early Christians.—When nothing could succeed in uprooting their religion,—they were marked for destruction by branding them as enemies to the government. So it is with us. But we challenge investigation. Let our accusers descend to particulars. We can point to those who were known to be traitors—they were not of our creed, nor were they what is improperly given as an appellation to: adopted citizens. They were not foreigners. When we are assailed, by our calumniators, we may answer, as the suffering soldiers of Pennsylvania line did to the British agents, who in the moment of their mutiny by reason of distress, and of unredressed wrong, ventured to offer them pardon, promotion and plenty, if they would go over to the enemy: *We are not Arnolds!*

“No! our calumniators will not undertake to do an impossibility. They will not promise to specify the faithlessness of Americans, whether native or adopted, to American institutions, but they will make vague charges, and dark insinuations, and write big words and refer to Europe. This device will fail! Though we are as a Body, the least wealthy, of the religious societies in the Union, we still have the greatest fund of true riches in the indomitable and laborious industry of our members. We have greatly increased, we are increasing, and we will increase, in numbers and in property,—and we trust in piety and zeal.

“Fifty years ago we had no Bishop—today we have sixteen Sees in the United States, and count an Archbishop and sixteen bishops. We have colleges, schools, convents, provinces of religious orders, and a well educated, zealous, and faithful priesthood. If the Catholic Church in the United States wants much for its perfection, she has done much and acquired much and her march is onwards. When we hail our national festival and rejoice at the prosperity of our country, we should also remember, that amidst greater obstacles and with less human means, our national church has also made a corresponding advance and with God’s blessing, the standard of the cross will float in safety under that clustering constellation which we hope will, ere the lapse of the century, shed its peaceful influence upon a confederation of republics diffusing to distant shores in its own ships, the fruits of its industry, and receiving from other nations the tribute of their wealth in its ports on the Atlantic and Pacific. We pray that as our country adds to the years of her history, she may add also the light of knowledge, the riches of piety, the charity of religion, the affection of her citizens, their honour, before men and their favour before heaven.”

In May, 1841, Bishop England set sail from Charleston for Liverpool on what proved to be his last voyage. His appeal in Ireland for financial help and for Sisters and priests had been

generously responded to, and he looked forward to a new and vigorous year for the Faith in the Southland. We have no means of knowing why he accepted Bishop Kenrick's invitation to preach every evening for the first two weeks after his arrival in Philadelphia from Europe in November, 1841. The exertion involved in this series of discourses broke him physically and when he reached Charleston on December 9, 1841, it was visible to all that his health was in a precarious state. From this time until April, 1842, he slowly declined in vigor, and on Monday, April 11, he passed away. The eulogies printed in the non-Catholic press after his death are remarkable for their unrestrained praise of the man and the prelate. The Catholic newspapers were not far behind in their eulogy of the dead bishop. One editorial from the *Boston Pilot* sums up fairly the feeling of loss the faithful experienced in his death:

"Gloom, deep, impenetrable gloom, has gathered upon the brow of the Catholic! The sombre habiliments of mourning and melancholy send their darkening shadows around their altars! Tears come welling up from the heart's fountain of sorrow, and the solemn chant and mournful dirge tell that the great, the good, the beloved and the lamented, has been gathered to the dust; that a light has gone out from amongst us, which has guided us in the path of virtue and Christian faith; that the shepherd hath been called from his flock, and they are buried in sorrow and affliction. Bishop England is dead! None shall again hear him with a monarch's voice proclaim the great doctrines of the Catholic Church. No more shall we see that glorious countenance radiant with the halo of Divine inspiration. Never again shall we listen to his exalted precepts, no more shall the mind bow captive to the masculine power of his logic, or the perspicuous and over-whelming splendor of his reasoning. That proud and towering intellect that seemed to reach heaven in its flight, and draw proofs of the immaculate purity of his creed from its eternal throne, hath left its earthly tenement, and ascended to its kindred element. God hath taken to himself the brightest and purest of the land! him, who like some Christian Jupiter wielded the thunder of truth, and went forth to illumine the path of the desponding mortal, who spoke but to convince, and who shed a glory refulgent with hope, around the sceptic heart.

"It is the death of such a man we mourn. All feel that one had gone down to the grave, the greatness of whose mind, and whose benevolence and eloquent example had ennobled human nature. That the earth has closed over one who stood a pillar of immov-

able power to the Catholic Church of America: whose resplendent genius, mellowed with the sacred influences of his high and holy mission, shone forth in the beauty and majesty of a mind endowed with more than human intellect. None can feel the terrible calamity that has fallen upon the ministry of truth and religion, but those who have listened to him when pouring forth the reflections of his lofty mind, who have heard his masterly and convincing reasoning, and felt the power of his sublime oratory. Far from the land of his kindred, and which he loved so well, he slumbers in the tomb over whose dust ages may roll, but not produce one so great, so pure, so good."

Bishop England was unquestionably the foremost ecclesiastic in the Catholic Church of the United States during the years he presided over the Diocese of Charleston. He was considered and rightly so by the people of his race here their leading representative. His writings rank him as the first apologist of the Catholic Faith in this country. His long and successful campaign to create a common discipline through a National Council gave him a prominence beyond all his colleagues in the American hierarchy. His apostolic delegation to Haiti made his name known in political circles abroad and occasioned the desire to see him raised to the cardinalate. His place in the history of classical education in the South is an enviable one. He lived through a social and political unrest which almost brought South Carolina to the pass it boldly entered less than twenty years after John England's death. His life as an American bishop was that of a great patriot and a great Christian. Spent as it was in the midst of religious animosities which would have disheartened many a bishop in Christendom, he never lost courage and all along the years of his episcopate won victories for Catholicism which have seldom been equalled in our history. John England died loved by his priests and people, admired by multitudes outside his Faith, respected by all who had heard his eloquent voice or who had read his defense of Catholic principles.

The secret of John England's life before he came to America lies in his high-minded liberalism, in his generous tolerance of all men who differed with him in politics and religion, and in his profound attachment to the principles of democratic government. The dynamic power of his tireless energy as a bishop in the United States came straight and true from his whole-souled love

for America and for American methods. No man of his times in the realm of politics or religion watched more jealously over the preservation of the ideals upon which the Republic was built. Sometimes, the surge of his writings may seem to carry him high upon the crest of the wave which was revealing the influence of the sons and daughters of Ireland in American affairs; but John England's life can be misunderstood if he is pictured solely as a great Irishman or as a great Irishman whom America adopted for her own. He was more than this, he was an American with all that mystical love for America which is visible in the leaders of the earlier days of the nation's history. It is on account of his untrammelled Americanism, on account of his thorough grasp of American idealism, and above all because of the unique place he made for himself in American history in interpreting justly and accurately to his own epoch the harmony between Catholic principles and the constitutional bases of the American government that he stands pre-eminent among the Catholic bishops of this land. As an American bishop he carried on the traditions of John Carroll, not indeed without Carroll's occasional misunderstanding of Roman policy, but with a world-view that ranks him among the immortal names of the American Church. He lived and died for souls, for America, for the Church, and for God.

At the conclusion of Dr. Guilday's lecture Mr. King congratulated him upon his address and thanked him for the pleasure he had given to the Society, promising that the address would be printed and distributed in *RECORDS AND STUDIES* issued by the United States Catholic Historical Society.

Mr. King then introduced the Rev. John LaFarge, S. J., of *America*, the national Catholic weekly, to speak on the great work in which he was interested, the marking of the site of the first Catholic Church in old St. Mary's City, Maryland, the stones of which still remain on the old plantation where it was erected in Lord Baltimore's day. Father LaFarge said:

I feel a strange emotion in speaking here tonight. Several years ago, when I addressed this same illustrious body, all I could do was to call your attention to a deplorable situation. I saw no remedy; and attempted remedies would not improve matters.

St. Mary's City, Maryland, is the cradle of our Colonial Catholicism. But I had to tell you then no sign is there of what the past of that spot represents to us. Eighty years ago a Catholic traveler from Philadelphia visited the spot, and regretted that no sign was left to indicate the past glories of that place from a Catholic standpoint. Those eighty years have passed by; and things are today as they were then. Hundreds of other Catholics have either visited St. Mary's or heard of it, and all have felt and expressed the same regret.

Since 1781, or thereabouts, that site, situated in the old Jesuit Chapel Lot of $37\frac{1}{2}$ acres, has been in the hands of non-Catholics. It was acquired by Mr. Mackall at that time and passed into the hands of its present owners, the Bromes. Boundaries and landmarks are as plain today as they were in Mackall's map of 1781, discovered most providentially only two years ago at Annapolis. This map is based on an earlier map of 1741: and these in turn identical with Cuthbert Fenwick's patent of 1641, which is now in our Jesuit Archives in New York.

The Chapel, as you know, was built between 1638 and 1643, by Father Thomas Copley, S. J. It was closed in 1704 by order of the royal Governor. It was still standing in 1727, just 200 years ago. The Jesuit residence at St. Mary's City was abandoned for St. Inigoes Manor in 1640, and no one knows precisely what became of the old Chapel after that; but many remnants of the bricks are still there, lying in the plowed ground, some under an adjacent barn; and until very recently the rise in the ground, caused by the ancient foundations, was clearly visible.

The fitness of such a memorial needs I think no explanation. The design in the form of an open-air altar, surmounted by a brick vault in Colonial design, serves to recall the sacred character of the ancient edifice, while being also artistically pleasing, and in harmony with the peaceful, level surroundings.

The site of the Chapel will be the natural focus for the Catholic celebration of the Tercentennial of 1934, commemorating the founding of the Maryland Colony in 1634.

It will also serve as a focus, a true shrine, for Catholic American History, to which object your association is dedicated. Two great motives enter into this idea of the Chapel site as a Shrine of Catholic American History. One is *piety*: for the spot is the

cradle of Catholicism in the East, the spot from which the organized hierarchical and continuous sacramental life of the Church in the United States took its rise.

The other motive is *patriotism*, in the highest sense. That Memorial, with what it recalls, will remind the present and all future generations of the part played by Catholics in the foundation of this Republic: in their cooperation of hand, heart and mind in its very fashioning: Catholic, American heritage. It will remind them too of that generous-minded body of men, Protestants and Catholics alike, who worked together at St. Mary's City for the realization of their ideal of religious toleration and civic freedom.

It is, let me remark, a civic memorial, not a church or consecrated place of liturgical devotion. The building of a church or shrine-chapel there was not practical or practicable, for many reasons. It is not the site of the "First Mass" in the Maryland Colony. That first Mass was celebrated on St. Clement's Island from which the colonists later came to their permanent settlement at St. Mary's City.

My proposition is to recommend this project to the whole country, as a project of national interest. This is not merely a practical way of distributing the financial burden, but also a way of bringing home, just at this troubled moment, the great lesson in American Catholic patriotism that the memories of the Chapel site evoke.

Forty-five thousand dollars are needed for the Memorial. I should like to see this amount raised in sums of \$1,000 or \$500, granted either by individuals or by organizations, whose names would be duly recorded on the Memorial, to remain there forever.

Can the United States Catholic Historical Society sponsor this plan? Can it lead in the campaign? If so, I believe its success is assured. If you can see your way toward taking this Memorial under your patronage, as it were, making it peculiarly your own, it will stand endorsed before the whole country, and moreover it will be an achievement of which your Association will always be proud. Such a plan is dear to my own heart as a New Yorker, as one whose sentiments and family traditions are bound up with the Catholic history of New York City. If His Eminence ap-

proves, and your Society will lend its support to the furtherance of this appeal I believe the Memorial can be erected in the immediate future.

Answering the invitation of President King to say a few words, His Eminence Cardinal Hayes thanked Dr. Guilday for coming to the meeting and presenting such a valuable, inspiring and informative paper. He said it was "a lesson for our times" on the subject of tolerance and that he was glad that the Society was going to print the paper for wide distribution.

"I wish," said the Cardinal, "our public press would realize that the present situation in regard to intolerance is not a new one, but that it seems to us as old as the country itself. It is a pity that it is so. When the chapter on 'Intolerance' in our country is finally closed and sealed forever, then I believe that a tribute will be paid to the Catholic Church in America—that she has never been intolerant.

"We have always been tolerant in every sense to our fellow-citizens. The Catholic Church in America has always taught her children to practice toleration in a spirit of Christian charity toward our fellow-citizens irrespective of their creed."

He also cordially endorsed Father LaFarge's proposition for the Maryland Pilgrim Memorial and promised when the proper time came "New York would do her part."

Later the Board of Directors of the United States Catholic Historical Society made a contribution from its funds of \$1,000 to start the Memorial project as Father LaFarge had suggested.

The election of officers had the following results: Honorary president, His Eminence Patrick Cardinal Hayes; president, Percy J. King; vice-president, Joseph H. Fargis; treasurer, Henry Ridder; corresponding secretary, Edward K. Hanlon; recording secretary, Arthur F. J. Rémy, Ph.D.; librarian, the Right Rev. Monsignor Joseph F. Delany, D.D.; trustees, the Rev. Thomas P. Phelan, Joseph F. Keany, Francis J. Quinlan, M.D.; Thomas F. Meehan, Frederick J. Fuller, Rev. Brother Thomas; councillors, the Right Rev. Monsignor John P. Chidwick, D.D.; Edward J. McGuire, Arthur Kenedy, William J. Amend, Martin Conboy, John G. Coyle, M.D.; the Rev. Gerald C. Treacy, S. J.

The treasurer, Henry Ridder, reported the finances of the society to be in the most satisfactory condition.

The Committee on Memorial for Peter Condon, Esq., recording secretary of the United States Catholic Historical Society for many years, presented this report:

In the early part of 1924 Peter Condon refused the unanimous request of the Executive Committee of the Society to continue as a member of the Committee and as its Recording Secretary, a position he had held for many years. On July 15th, 1924, Peter Condon closed all his records of life and went to meet the Great Recorder and Judge, and with him went a certain savor of life in New York as it was lived by the older generation. He saw the city grow from year to year but always with a background of the scenes of his boyhood, so that his conversation was delightful to one even with a superficial knowledge of the growth.

In 1861 he entered St. Francis Xavier's College and received his degree of Bachelor of Arts in 1868 when he was in his eighteenth year. In 1871 Peter Condon was awarded his Master of Arts degree from his own college. The seven years he spent under the care of the Jesuit Fathers, were a period of great activity in the intellectual life of Catholic New York, embracing as they did the Civil War period and the Reconstruction Era following upon the cessation of the Northern and Southern contest for supremacy. Following his graduation from college he studied law under Mr. Gershan A. Seixas, one of the oldest lawyers in the City of New York and was admitted to the bar in 1872. Peter Condon continued his associations with Mr. Seixas for over twenty-eight years and thereafter until the time of his death practised alone.

In 1874, he married Miss Ellen McCarten, daughter of John McCarten of New York City, in St. Francis Xavier's Church, the ceremony being performed by the Rev. Hyppolite de Luynes, S. J. Early in his career he became legal advisor for the Eastern Province of the Capuchin Order, which position he held for thirty-four years up to the time of his death. In addition to the ordinary work of a lawyer he gave largely of his time as counsel to various religious and benevolent associations to which his legal experience and knowledge were invaluable.

Like a number of the older students of the College of St. Francis Xavier Peter Condon's activities were not confined to his professional life but his culture and ability led him to pursue with pleasure music, art and literature. He was for a number of years a member of the choir of old St. Francis Xavier's under the direction of his friend, the well-known organist and choir master, Mr. William Berge.

He was one of the founders in 1879 of the Alumni Association of the College of St. Francis Xavier and at its first meeting in May 1879 he was elected treasurer, with Charles G. Herberman as president; Bishop Wigger, historian; Father Gabriel Healy, first vice-president; Thomas S. O'Brien, second vice-president and Cornelius R. Sullivan, secretary. These boyhood and college friends remained in close intimacy throughout their lives and formed a group that for many years continued as a positive intellectual force in our City, advancing the cause of Catholic education and Catholic literature while they also performed the necessary and useful functions of the particular office or profession which formed their daily work.

Some years ago Mr. Condon sold the property on which his country home was located at Madison, New Jersey, to his old friend, Bishop Wigger of Newark, and on the family homestead there now stands a church and rectory and school conducted by the Sisters of Charity. He was for a number of years a member of the Xavier Union, which later became the Catholic Club of the City of New York. From 1890 to 1892 he served as president of the St. Francis Xavier Alumni Association. He was a member of a number of literary societies and organizations and was a trustee, councillor and recording secretary of the United States Catholic Historical Society, continuing in office until a few months before his death. He contributed articles to the Society's publication, to the *Catholic Fortnightly Review* of St. Louis and the *Christian Mother* of New York City and *America*. He was the author of a number of articles in the "Catholic Encyclopedia" and compiled a "Life of the Cure of Ars."

He was a God-fearing, cultured gentleman of splendid taste and ability whose broad and useful life stands as a monument to his industry and ability. His passing leaves the United States Catholic Historical Society much poorer not only because of the loss to

it of his zealous work but because there has been taken from the Society his gentle courtesy, great devotion and personal loveableness. The Society records these expressions of its deep sense of loss and bereavement in his demise.

JOSEPH H. FARGIS,

ARTHUR KENEDY,

PERCY J. KING,

Committee.

Following the adjournment of the meeting came the social hour at which a collation was served.

THE OLDEST AMERICAN BOOK

Among the treasures that the lavish generosity of Mr. Archer Huntington has gathered in the New York library of the Hispanic Society of America is the only perfect copy extant of "Doctrina Cristiana," the oldest book printed in North America. This is a small volume of 167 pages, measuring $4\frac{1}{4} \times 6\frac{1}{2}$ inches, printed in Spanish in beautiful, clear black-letter type, without folios, running heads or chapter captions. Its purpose and date are told in the dedication which is inserted on the last page. This reads: "To the honor and praise of Our Lord Jesus Christ and the Glorious Holy Virgin, His Mother. It is for this that the present treatise is finished. The which was seen and examined and corrected by order of the Right Reverend Lord Bishop, Juan Zumárraga, first Bishop of Mexico, and of the Council of His Majesty. It was printed in the great city of Tenochtitlan, of Mexico, of this New Spain. And in this house of Juan Cromberger, by order of the same Lord Bishop, Juan Zumarrága, and at his cost. The printing was finished on the 14th day of June of the year 1544."

The United States Catholic Historical Society has long desired to reproduce in facsimile this precious example of the earliest American printing and applied to the officials of the Hispanic Society of America for permission to do so. In a short time the following reply was received:

HISPANIC SOCIETY BUILDING
NEW YORK CITY

November 9th, 1927.

Thomas F. Meehan, Esquire,

Dear Sir:

We are sending under separate cover a photographic reproduction of the book "Doctrina Cristiana" by Zumárraga. It is sent to you with the compliments of the President and Trustees of the Hispanic Society of America.

Yours very truly,

THE HISPANIC SOCIETY OF AMERICA,
Department of the Library.

For this most gracious and generous courtesy President King sent the following formal acknowledgement:

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY
346 CONVENT AVENUE, NEW YORK CITY

December 15th, 1927.

To the President of the Hispanic Society of America,

Dear Sir:

I take much pleasure in sending you the following copy of a minute from the proceedings of the Executive Council of the United States Catholic Historical Society, held December 12th, 1927:

"Resolved, that the very sincere thanks of the United States Catholic Historical Society are due to and hereby are tendered to the Hispanic Society of America for the permission accorded us to reproduce the "*Doctrina Cristiana*" and for the very generous cooperation of Mr. Archer M. Huntington and the officials of the Hispanic Society of America in assisting the United States Catholic Historical Society in its desires to publish for its members a facsimile reproduction of this, the oldest extant volume of the press of the New World.

"Resolved, that the President formally transmit this minute of appreciation and thanks to the President of the Hispanic Society of America.."

I perform this duty, Mr. President, with very great pleasure and beg to assure you of my own personal appreciation of the courtesy and kindness of the Hispanic Society of America towards the United States Catholic Historical Society.

Very sincerely yours,

PERCY J. KING,

President, U. S. Catholic Historical Society.

The photographic prints were then given to Mr. Stephen H. Horgan, a member of our Society, and the acknowledged leading expert in the art of photo-engraving, to have plates made of them for reproduction in facsimile by the United States Catholic Historical Society, as the next volume in its Monograph Series of Catholic historical records, for distribution among the members of the Society and the Catholic and other important libraries of the country. A history of the book, and of the earliest production, despite the forbidding conditions, of the printer's

craft in the New World, will be included. This will be contributed by the Rev. Zephyrin Englehardt, O.F.M., the historian of the old Spanish Missions, who kindly accepted the Society's invitation to thus assist in making this one of the Society's most notable and valuable publications and which will immediately follow this issue of *RECORDS AND STUDIES*. There is a popular fallacy that the first book printed in North America was the "Bay State Psalm-Book" turned out in January, 1639, by the Daye press at Cambridge, Massachusetts. The date of the "Doctrina Cristiana" controverts this. But the "Doctrina" was not the first American book. That honor goes to the "Escalera Espiritual" ("The Spiritual Ladder") by St. John Climacus, a Spanish translation, prepared in 1536, by Friar Juan de Estrada for the use of the Dominican novices of the Mexican province of that Order. No copy of this book, however, now exists. It was printed by Juan Pablos, who was the first printer to set up a press on this side of the globe. Bishop Zumárraga also was a Religious, a Franciscan, and one of the great prelates whose records give the lie to the current slanders against the Church.

UNITED STATES CATHOLIC HISTORICAL SOCIETY

Honorary President

HIS EMINENCE PATRICK CARDINAL HAYES

President

PERCY J. KING

Vice-President

JOSEPH H. FARGIS, LL.D.

Treasurer

HENRY RIDDER

Executive Secretary

E. P. HERBERMANN

Recording Secretary

ARTHUR F. J. RÉMY, Ph.D.

Librarian

RT. REV. MGR. JOSEPH F. DELANY, D.D.

Trustees

JOSEPH F. KEANY

FRANCIS J. QUINLAN, M.D.

THOMAS F. MEEHAN

FREDERICK J. FULLER

REV. BROTHER THOMAS

Councillors

RT. REV. MGR. JOHN P.

EDWARD J. MCGUIRE, LL.D.

CHIDWICK, D.D.

MARTIN CONBOY

REV. GERALD C. TREACY, S.J.

ARTHUR KENEDY

WILLIAM J. AMEND

REV. THOMAS P. PHELAN

JOHN G. COYLE, M.D.

Members

ADAMS, ROBERT A.

ASPELL, DR. JOHN

ADAMS, SAMUEL

BARRETT, ALFRED M.

ADAMS, T. ALBEUS

BARRETT, DANIEL J.

ADIKES, JOHN

BARRETT, NICHOLAS J.

AGAR, JOHN G.

BARTLEY, REV. JAMES R.

AMEND, WILLIAM J.

BENZIGER, ALFRED F.

- BENZIGER, BRUNO
 BENZIGER, LOUIS G.
 BISTER, JOHN
 BLAKE, MICHAEL
 BOGAN, REV. B. M.
 BOWRON, MRS. CLARA A.
 BOSTON COLLEGE LIBRARY
 BOSTON PUBLIC LIBRARY
 BRADY, VERY REV. MGR.
 JOHN F.
 BRESLIN, REV. P. N.
 BRESLIN, T. J.
 BRISTED, C. A.
 BRITT, PHILIP J.
 BRODERICK, DANIEL I.
 BRONSON, ADDISON W.
 BROPHY, MRS. W. H.
 BROWN, JOHN B.
 BRUNE, VERY REV. F. J.
 BUCHANAN, MRS. E. J.
 BURKE, PROF. EDMUND
 BYRNE, JAMES
 CAMPBELL, REV. JOSEPH C.
 CAMPBELL, FRANCIS P.
 CAPUCHIN FATHERS, N. Y.
 CAREY, PETER J.
 CARROLL, CORNELIUS
 CASEY, A. J.
 CAVANAUGH, RICHARD B.
 CHURCHILL, THOMAS W.
 CHUTE, ELIZABETH
 CLARE, WILLIAM F.
 CLARKE, RICHARD H.
 CLEARY, JOHN J.
 COAKLEY, REV. DR. THOMAS F.
 COHAN, GEORGE M.
 COKE, P. M.
 COLLIER, MRS. ROBERT
- COLUMBIA COLLEGE,
 DUBUQUE, IOWA
 CONBOY, MARTIN
 CONDON, JOHN F., M.D.
 CONLEY, LOUIS D.
 COLUMBIA UNIV. LIBRARY
 CONNOLLY, RT. REV. MGR.
 ARTHUR T.
 CONNOLLY, RT. REV. MGR.
 JAMES N.
 CONNOLLY, THOS. F. J.
 CONROY, CHARLES C.
 CONWAY, THOMAS F.
 CORRIGAN, RT. REV. OWEN B.,
 D.D.
 COSTELLO, REV. CHARLES A.
 COURTNEY, REV. W. A.
 COYLE, JOHN G., M.D.
 CRONIN, MISS JULIA L.
 CROWNE, J. VINCENT
 CUDDIHY, R. J.
 CUDDIHY, ARTHUR B.
 CUNNINGHAM, JOHN S.
 CURRY, FRANCIS A.
 DALY, M. A.
 DAVEY, HUGH J.
 DEITSCH, MISS M.
 DELANY, RT. REV. MGR.
 JOSEPH F., D.D.
 DELEHANTY, HON. F. B.
 DETROIT PUBLIC LIBRARY
 DEVOY, MRS. JOHN W.
 DONAHUE LIBRARY,
 SAN FRANCISCO, CAL.
 DONNELLY, RT. REV. MGR. E.
 J., V.F.
 DONNELLY, JOHN E.
 DONOGHUE, HON. F. X.
 DOODY, REV. DANIEL

DOOLEY, MICHAEL F.	GUILDAY, REV. PETER, D.D.
DOOLEY, REV. JOHN H.	GUINEVAN, REV. PETER F.
DOONER, EDWARD J.	GUTHRIE, WILLIAM D.
DOWD, REV. RICHARD A.	HAGGERTY, J. HENRY
DOWLING, MOST REV. AUSTIN, D.D.	HALLORAN, JOHN H.
	HANNIGAN, STEPHEN
DOWLING, HON. VICTOR J.	HARRIS, CHARLES N.
DOYLE, ALFRED L.	HARSON, M. J.
DOYLE, JOHN F., JR.	HAYES, CARROLL
DUFFY, REV. FRANCIS P.	HAYES, HIS EMINENCE
DUFFY, JAMES K.	PATRICK CARDINAL
DUFFY, JAMES P. B.	HAYWARD, DR. V. S.
DURNING, HARRY M.	HEIDE, HENRY
DUTTON, JOSEPH	HEIDE, HENRY, JR.
EWING, CHARLES	HEIDE, WILLIAM F.
FALAHEE, JOHN J.	HERBERMANN, ELIZABETH P.
FARGIS, JOSEPH H.	HERBERMANN, HENRY
FARRELL, J. F.	HERBERMANN, HENRY F.
FARRELL, JAMES A.	HICKEY, RT. REV. MGR.
FAUSS, DENNIS C.	DAVID J.
FAUTEUX, REV. AEGIDIUS	HOEY, JAMES J.
FEEHAN, RT. REV. D. F., D.D.	HOFFMAN, REV. THOS. A.
FICKINGER, E. H.	HOGUET, ROBERT L.
FINN, REV. THOMAS J., LL.D.	HOLY CROSS COLLEGE,
FINNIGAN, ELIZABETH MORAN	WORCESTER, MASS.
FLOYD-JONES, G. STANTON	HORGAN, STEPHEN H.
FOX, PROF. WILLIAM	HURLEY, RT. REV. MGR.
FRANKLIN, JOSEPH	EDWARD F.
FULLER, FREDERICK J.	HURLEY, JAMES F.
GASSLER, REV. LEON	JEFFERSON COLLEGE,
GAVEGAN, HON. EDWARD J.	CONVENT, LA.
GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY	JEURGENS, REV. A. M.
GIBLIN, GEORGE J.	JOHNSON, ALFRED J.
GILLESPIE, GEORGE J.	JOYCE, MICHAEL J.
GLEASON, REV. JOSEPH M.	KEANY, JOSEPH F.
GRACE, JOSEPH P.	KELLEY, RT. REV. FRANCIS C.
GRADY, REV. JOSEPH E.	KELLEY, REV. THOMAS B.
GRADY, WALTER L.	KELLY, CHARLES R.
GUERTIN, RT. REV. G. A., D.D.	KELLY, MRS. HUGH

- KELLY, REV. JOSEPH S.
 KELLY, THOMAS H.
 KENEDY, ARTHUR
 KENNY, WILLIAM F.
 KENT, JOHN S.
 KEYES, EDWARD L.
 KING, A. J.
 KING, PERCY J.
 KINKEAD, HON. EUGENE F.
 LARKIN, WILLIAM P.
 LAVELLE, RT. REV. MGR.
 M. J., D.D.
 LAWLER, JOSEPH A.
 LEARY, MRS. GEORGE
 LEEMING, HAROLD F.
 LINEHAN, PAUL H.
 LOYOLA SCHOOL, NEW YORK
 CITY
 LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, CHICAGO,
 ILL.
 LOYOLA UNIVERSITY, NEW
 ORLEANS, LA.
 LYDON, RICHARD P.
 LYNCH, THOMAS M.
 McANERNEY, JOHN
 McBRIDE, T. J.
 MCCARTHY, J. A.
 McCUE, THOMAS E.
 McDONALD, GEORGE
 McELROY, MRS. WM. B.
 McENTEGART, REV. BRYAN J.
 MCGOLRICK, RT. REV. MGR.
 EDWARD J.
 MCGIVNEY, RT. REV. MGR.,
 M. J.
 MCGUIRE, EDWARD J.
 MCGUIRE, JOSEPH HUBERT
 McKENNA, RT. REV. MGR.
 EDWARD
 McKENNA, THOMAS P.
 McKEON, MRS. ROBERT J.
 McKEON, ROBERT J.
 McLoughlin, MISS MARY J.
 McMAHON, FRANCIS M.
 McMAHON, RT. REV. MGR.
 JOSEPH H.
 McNABOE, JAMES F.
 McPARTLAND, JOHN E.
 MAGINNIS, MICHAEL
 MAGOVERN, MARY A.
 MAHONEY, J. T.
 MANHATTAN COLLEGE
 MARIQUE, PROF. PIERRE
 MARYMOUNT COLLEGE,
 TARRYTOWN, N. Y.
 MAUROCORDATO, ALEXANDER
 MAXWELL, W. J.
 MAYO, HON. JOHN B.
 MEEHAN, THOMAS F.
 MELVIN, THOMAS P.
 MESSMER, MOST REV. S. G.
 D.D.
 MOLLOY, JOSEPH A.
 MOLLOY, RT. REV. THOMAS E.,
 D.D.
 MORAN, JAMES, M.D.
 MORRELL, MRS. EDWARD
 MORRIS, RT. REV. JOHN B.,
 D.D.
 MORRIS, MRS. LEWIS GOUVER-
 NEUR
 MOTHER DOLORES, ST. VIN-
 CENT'S RETREAT, HARRISON,
 N. Y.
 MOTHER SUPERIOR, ACADEMY,
 MT. ST. VINCENT, N. Y.
 MOTHER SUPERIOR, SISTERS OF
 CHARITY, MT. ST. VINCENT,
 N. Y.

- MOUNT ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, DUBUQUE, IOWA
 MOUNT ST. JOSEPH'S COLLEGE, MT. ST. JOSEPH, OHIO
 MULLEN, REV. JOHN T., D.C.L.
 MULQUEEN, HON. JOSEPH F.
 MURPHY, REV. J. J.
 MURPHY, JOHN H.
 MURRIN, JAS. B.
 NAGELEISEN, REV. J. A., P.R.
 NAZARETH ACADEMY, NAZARETH, KY.
 NEAGLE, REV. RICHARD
 NEESER, JOHN G.
 NEILL, CHARLES P.
 NEW YORK FOUNDLING ASYLUM
 NOONAN, REV. JAMES E.
 O'BRIEN, CHARLES J.
 O'BRIEN, DENNIS F.
 O'BRIEN, DR. JOHN J.
 O'BRIEN, MORGAN J.
 O'BRIEN, REV. JOHN J.
 O'BRIEN, KENNETH
 O'BOYLE, JAMES F.
 O'CONNOR, JOHN L.
 ODIOENE, MRS. RUTH C.
 O'GORMAN, HON. JAMES A.
 O'GORMAN, RICHARD
 OHLIGSCHLOGER, J. B.
 O'KEEFE, RT. REV. MGR. T. M.
 O'LEARY, DENNIS
 O'MARRA, REV. PATRICK A.
 O'NEILL, REV. JOHN J.
 O'NEILL, REV. THOMAS LANTRY
 O'REILLY, THOMAS J.
 ORR, WILLIAM C.
- PALLAN, CONDÉ B., LL.D.
 PARSONS, EDWARD A.
 PARSONS, REV. WILFRID, S.J.
 PERAZZO, D.
 PHELAN, REV. THOMAS P.
 PHELAN, JOHN F.
 PRENDERGAST, WILLIAM A.
 PULLEYN, JOHN J.
 QUINLAN, FRANCIS J., M.D.
 REDEMPTORIST FATHERS, BROOKLYN, N. Y.
 REDWOOD, MOST REV. FRANCIS, D.D.
 REEVES, JAMES
 REID, REV. CHARLES F.
 REILLY, REV. M. A.
 RÉMY, PROF. A. F. J.
 RIDDER, HENRY
 ROE, J. A.
 ROSEMONT COLLEGE, ROSEMONT, PA.
 RYAN, JOHN D.
 RYAN, THOMAS F.
 SALVATORIAN FATHERS, WISCONSIN
 SCHOPP, ADAM A.
 SCHREMBBS, RT. REV. JOSEPH, D.D.
 SCOTT, JOSEPH
 SEEP, JOSEPH
 SELF, HARRIET
 SHAHAN, RT. REV. THOMAS J., D.D.
 SHEAHAN, REV. J. F.
 SLOANE, CHARLES W.
 SLOANE, DR. THOMAS O'CONOR
 SMITH, REV. JOSEPH F.

ST. AMBROSE COLLEGE, DAVENPORT, IOWA	THORBURN, C. J.
ST. BENEDICT'S ABBEY, ATCHISON, KAN.	TOBIN, REV. FRANCIS J.
ST. BERNARD'S SEMINARY, ROCHESTER, N. Y.	TREACY, REV. GERALD C., S.J.
ST. CHARLES COLLEGE, CATONSVILLE, MD.	TREACY, REV. JAMES P., D.D.
ST. JOHN'S COLLEGE, BROOK- LYN, N. Y.	TREW, FRANCES LOUISE
ST. LOUIS UNIVERSITY	VAN ANTWERP, RT. REV.
ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, PORT- LAND, ORE.	MGR. FRANCIS J.
ST. MARY OF THE LAKE SEM- INARY, MUNDELEIN, ILL.	VELASCO, DIONISIO
ST. MARY'S SEMINARY, BALTI- MORE	VERRETTE, REV. ADRIAN
ST. XAVIER'S COLLEGE, CIN- CINNATI	VILLANOVA COLLEGE, PENN- SYLVANIA
STEWART, REV. W. J.	WALL, CHARLES S.
SULLIVAN, W. C.	WEIR, REV. JOHN
TAFT, MRS. HENRY W.	WHALEN, GROVER M.
THOMAS, BROTHER	WICKHAM, REV. JOHN E.
	WICKHAM, JOSEPH F., LITT.D.
	WILLIAMS, C. A.
	WOODLOCK, THOMAS F., LL.D.
	WUCHER, VERY REV. THEO- PHILE, S.P.M.
	WYNNE, REV. JOHN J., S.J.
	YALE UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

JAN 01 2002 Date Due

JAN 02 2002

DEC 03 2009

E184.C3U5

v.18-007582

United States Catholic Historical
Society

AUTHOR

TITLE

Historical Records and Studies.

DATE DUE

BORROWER'S NAME

United States Catholic Historical
Society
Historical Records and Studies.

